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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
Executive Summary

Introduction

SANDAG Policy 18 (Regional Transit Service Planning and Implementation) requires that a Regional Short-Range Transit Plan (RSRTP) be developed each year. The RSRTP provides a five-year blueprint of how the transit concepts described in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) are to be implemented. The federal government, through the Safe Accountable Flexible and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) introduced a new requirement for each region to prepare a Locally Developed Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan (Coordinated Plan). The intent of the Coordinated Plan is to improve coordination in transportation planning and operations among public transit and human service transportation providers. The RSRTP and Coordinated Plan requirements include several areas which overlap and therefore, it was determined that the two documents should be combined.

The federal guidance requires that the Coordinated Plan be updated not less than once every four years while SANDAG Policy 18 requires that the RSRTP be updated every year. The combined RSRTP and Coordinated Plan will be updated each year at least until 2009 when SAFETEA-LU expires or is reauthorized. This year’s combined plan represents the first local effort at coordinated transportation planning. The initiative fits well with similar local initiatives to consolidate transit planning and strengthen coordination of human service transportation with a revitalized Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA). The expansion of the Coordinated Plan to include human services transportation planning will take some years to fully achieve, as is the case with consolidated transit planning. This Coordinated Plan is a work in progress and will be expanded and improved over the next few years.

The approval of the Coordinated Plan will make available approximately $2 million in new federal funding for New Freedom (NF) (transportation for people with disabilities) and Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) (commute transportation for individuals with limited means) projects in FY 2008.

Plan Overview

The development of the Coordinated Plan brings all publicly available transportation services under a single unified plan. Transportation services included in the Coordinated Plan are those services offered by private companies, non-profit organizations, public transit agencies, the regional planning authority, and human services agencies. Given this broad approach, the Coordinated Plan represents a significant expansion of transportation planning activities conducted in the region and, as a result, creates a “one region – one network – one plan” concept of public transit and human services transportation.
The fundamental intent of this Coordinated Plan is to improve transportation services by promoting coordination among agencies actively involved in transportation and by removing inefficiencies caused by redundant or duplicative services. It also is the intent of this Coordinated Plan to establish objectives for the evaluated services to address service gaps and to develop strategies or projects designed to fill those service gaps as funding becomes available.

In addition to bringing public transit and human services transportation under one planning umbrella, the Coordinated Plan represents a “passenger-centered” approach to finding transportation solutions for the region’s residents. The Coordinated Plan also draws upon a vast tool kit of transportation solutions ranging from conventional public transit to ride-sharing services, technological solutions, and volunteer programs. In the past, each agency was limited to the services within their own operation. This passenger-centered approach looks at the mobility needs first, and then seeks to employ mobility management techniques to match the appropriate modal choice to the passenger.

The following chapter information provides a brief overview of the various components of the Coordinated Plan.

**Chapter 1 - Introduction**

The introductory chapter provides the background on the RSRTP and Coordinated Plan and describes the passenger-centered approach to implementing the plan. The chapter also identifies each of the formal regional, state, and federal requirements fulfilled by this plan.

**Chapter 2 - Community Involvement and Outreach**

An extensive community outreach program was developed for this Coordinated Plan to satisfy federal requirements along with ensuring diverse public input to help provide insight into local transportation needs. This community outreach program consisted of several stakeholder meetings held throughout the county including one in the rural area. Two publicly-noticed hearings also were held, with one meeting in North County and the other in Central County. The outreach program included sending out 584 invitations to stakeholders groups and requesting 628 agencies, individuals, and businesses complete surveys related to the plan. Additional public outreach was conducted as part of seven mini-grants awarded to community based organizations to ensure input from residents throughout the region typically not involved in the regional transportation planning process. In addition, a dedicated meeting was held with tribal representatives.
Chapter 3 - Public and Human Service Transportation Vision

The intent of the Coordinated Plan to meld the visions and missions of four transportation agencies into a coordinated transportation approach for San Diego County is described in this chapter. Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and North County Transit District (NCTD) are conventional public transit agencies, while the CTSA is a special purpose agency dedicated to improving, consolidating, and coordinating health and human services transportation in the region. SANDAG is the RSRTP with specific responsibilities for long- and short-range transit planning. The Mission, Vision, and Goals for each agency are listed in this section to set the stage for the RSRTP and Coordinated Plan.

Chapter 4 - Goals, Objectives, and Monitoring

The Coordinated Plan has been specifically prepared to provide a policy framework in order to establish goals and objectives to implement and measure the public and human services transportation network in San Diego County. This policy framework, included in this chapter, will allow SANDAG to carefully evaluate transit performance as required by the Transportation Development Act (TDA), and human services transportation performance as required by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). This section also includes a forward looking strategy, so that a more comprehensive analysis of transit service from the regional and passenger perspectives can be performed in future years as more detailed data becomes available from new technologies. From the human services perspective, this chapter identifies the performance measures for human services transportation and provides the baseline against which performance will be evaluated in the future.

Chapter 4 also includes a series of objectives, indicators, targets, and guidelines that provide a means of measuring the performance of the overall public transportation network in San Diego County. The objectives, indicators, and targets from this section will be used annually in conjunction with the quarterly reports of the TDA performance measures to assess the record of MTS and NCTD in meeting the performance evaluation required for the TDA. Some examples are provided in the Coordinated Plan which illustrates how MTS and NCTD services have compared to the proposed transit objectives and guidelines. However, a complete assessment was not done as the entire MTS system was recently redesigned as a result of the Comprehensive Operations Analysis (COA) and changes will soon be implemented by NCTD upon start-up of the SPRINTER light rail service.
Chapter 5 - Socio-Economic Analysis

In order to provide appropriate transportation solutions for the region’s population, the underlying demographic trends were examined to develop a better understanding of how these trends shape the regional travel patterns and transportation needs. The information used to conduct this evaluation presented in this chapter includes an assessment of demographic data regarding regional population, housing, and employment trends. The development of an understanding of how these trends affect persons with limited incomes, individuals with disabilities, and older adults was critical in determining the unique transportation needs of these population groups as required by SAFETEA-LU.

Chapter 6 - System Inventory and Regional Context

This chapter provides a comprehensive inventory of the public transportation services available in the San Diego region. A detailed list of about 120 social services transportation providers is included in an appendix to this chapter with services catered to disabled, elderly, and/or low-income populations. Services to and from the surrounding counties of Riverside, Orange, Imperial, and the border with Mexico, also have been included in this inventory.

Chapter 7 - Assessment of Needs

The needs assessment chapter includes the identification of existing transit service gaps, as well as the identification of other areas to improve the overall public transit and human services transportation network. Existing gaps and transportation needs included in this section were identified through the socio-economic analysis and through the public outreach activities described in Chapter 2.

To determine the specific needs, the socio-economic analysis was combined with transit service information to further explore locations without existing transit service. In future Coordinated Plans, the analysis of service gaps also will be based on the evaluation of the transportation system using a complete range of objectives and indicators. A limited set of objectives and indicators are utilized in this Coordinated Plan as the current available data is based on the pre-COA network of MTS. In the case of NCTD, the existing bus network also will change significantly later this year when the SPRINT rail service is operating.
Chapter 8 - Strategies and Projects

Chapter 8 identifies strategies designed to address the deficiencies and gaps in transportation services and to identify potentially redundant, unused, or duplicative services. The strategies included in this section were developed to respond to the needs identified as a result of various outreach efforts, demographic research and spatial transit analysis. Creative and cost-effective solutions are emphasized in order to expand the possibilities of developing an effective and efficient coordinated public transit and human services transportation system in the San Diego region. In the future this analysis also will include the proposals that respond to deficiencies and gaps resulting from the evaluation of the objectives, indicators, and guidelines provided in Chapter 4.

Chapter 9 - Financial Plan

The financial plan chapter provides an overview of the major sources of public transit and human services transportation funds available from the FTA. Currently, funds for transportation services are derived from a variety of public and private sources. However, this plan only addresses funds that are available, either in whole or in part, from public programs. The chapter explains the various federal, state, and local funding programs for public transit and human services transportation.

Chapter 10 - Implementation

The implementation chapter explains how SANDAG will serve as a conduit for federal, state, and local funding of existing and future services recommended in this plan. Competitive proposal calls will be held for public and private providers for funding opportunities such as 5310 (seniors and persons with disabilities), JARC, NF, and the future seniors’ mini-grant program. This section also explains how SANDAG will monitor new and existing services based on the achievement of the goals, objectives, guidelines, and targets established in this document.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 One Region – One Network – One Plan

The Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act – A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) was signed into law by President Bush in 2005. This extension of the Transportation Reauthorization Act introduced a requirement that funding for three federal programs be derived from a locally developed, Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan (Coordinated Plan). These federal programs are Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) (Section 5316), New Freedom (NF) (Section 5317), and Elderly and Persons with Disabilities (Section 5310), which have been designed to meet the transportation needs of individuals with limited means, people with disabilities, and older adults. The Governor of California has determined that SANDAG will be the designated recipient of funds for these three programs.

SANDAG has developed this Coordinated Plan based on the new federal requirements. The development of the Coordinated Plan includes the coordination of all publicly available transportation services into one unified plan. Applicable transportation services included in the Coordinated Plan are those services offered by private companies, non-profit organizations, public transit agencies, the regional planning authority, and human service agencies. Given this broad approach, the Coordinated Plan represents a significant expansion of transportation planning activities conducted in the region and, as a result, creates a “one region – one network – one plan” concept of public transit and human services transportation planning.

The fundamental intent of this plan is to improve transportation services by promoting coordination among agencies actively involved in transportation and by removing inefficiencies caused by redundant or duplicative services. It also is the intent of this Coordinated Plan to address existing gaps in service and to develop strategies or projects designed to fill those service gaps. This Coordinated Plan also represents a consolidated planning framework for evaluating transit and human service transportation under other state and regional mandates.

1.2 A Passenger-Centered Approach

In addition to bringing public transit and human service transportation under one planning umbrella, the Coordinated Plan represents a “passenger-centered” approach to finding transportation solutions for the region’s residents. The first step is to identify and define the mobility needs of the public. Then the most appropriate solution, such as conventional fixed-route public transit, ADA Paratransit, human service transportation programs, or volunteer driver programs can be designed to meet the identified mobility needs. This approach meets the objective of the Federal United We Ride program to improve coordination among transportation providers. The individual operators, such as the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), the North County Transit District (NCTD), human service agencies and individual cities remain responsible for preparing their own operational plans in response to the needs identified in this document.
This plan draws upon a vast toolkit of transportation solutions ranging from conventional public transit, to ride sharing services, technological solutions, and volunteer programs. In the past, each agency was limited to the plans relating to the services within their own operation. This passenger-centered approach looks at the mobility needs first, and then seeks to match the appropriate modal choice. This approach introduces the concept of mobility management and is now possible as a result of new federal funding formulae enabling SANDAG to have a greater impact in the development of human service transportation operations.

This method of evaluating transportation focuses on coordination which has traditionally not been emphasized. In addition, this approach integrates human service transportation systems that, until now, went largely unrecognized within the context of regional planning.

A passenger-centered approach to transportation planning for the San Diego region also requires a shift in thinking about the needs of the individual travelers. With a passenger centric model, it follows that an understanding of the passenger’s needs be developed so that individual travel needs can be determined. The Coordinated Plan focuses on the identification of specific population groups that are more likely to be dependent on public transit and human service transportation. These groups, which have been federally mandated for inclusion in the Coordinated Plan, are:

1. **Persons with limited means**: Refers to an individual whose family income is at or below 150 percent of the poverty line for a family of the size involved.

2. **Individuals with disabilities**: Includes individuals who, because of illness, injury, age, congenital malfunction, or other incapacity or temporary or permanent disability (including an individual who is a wheelchair user or has semi-ambulatory capacity), cannot use effectively, without special facilities, planning, or design, public transportation service or a public transportation facility.

3. **Older adults**: Includes, at a minimum, all persons 65 years of age or older.

Language has also been included in the federal transportation reauthorization act which allocates specific funding pools for projects designed for these groups. To identify transportation needs and potential solutions for these populations, specific demographic research data has been evaluated and feedback has been incorporated from the outreach efforts conducted for this plan. In addition, the Coordinated Plan has been developed to account for a transportation system that has grown to include a much larger pool of demand responsive services, potential opportunities for innovative technological enhancements, human service agency assistance programs and cooperative arrangements.

### 1.3 Public Transit Evaluation

The incorporation of human service transportation into public transportation planning represents new opportunities, including a chance to define public transportation policies and objectives for the region. The Coordinated Plan includes a series of goals and objectives by which the complete public transportation system will be measured in future years.

---

1 A Regional Short-range Transit Plan (RSRTP) was not prepared in Fiscal Year 2006 (FY 06) due to time constraints and the uncertainty over the new federal Coordinated Plan requirements. However, the Coordinated Plan will serve as the RSRTP for this year and future years since transit service evaluation is included in the plan.
The Coordinated Plan will incorporate elements contained in previous Regional Short Range Transit Plans (RSRTPs) relating to the transit agencies, but will more clearly evaluate those transit services by specific location type (urban, suburban and rural) along a five-year horizon and link it to existing State of California Transportation Development Act (TDA) evaluation processes. The methodology for conducting this evaluation is outlined in Chapters 3 and 4 of this plan.

1.4 Federal, State, and Regional Planning Requirements

The requirement for a Coordinated Plan is derived from federal legislation. However, the contents also incorporate other planning requirements. The federal, state, and regional requirements behind the various Coordinated Plan components are described below and shown graphically in Figure 1.1.

**Figure 1.1: Coordinated Plan Requirements and Components**

[Diagram showing the components and requirements of the Coordinated Plan, including federal, state, and local requirements, with detailed sections and performance measures.]
1.4.1 Federal Requirements

The new federal funding programs in Sections 5310, 5316, and 5317 of the transportation reauthorization act require that the Coordinated Plan include the following elements “at a level consistent with available resources and the complexity of the local institutional environment”:

- An inventory and assessment of available services that identifies current transportation providers from the public, private, and nonprofit sectors;
- An assessment of transportation needs for individuals with disabilities, older adults, and persons with limited means. This assessment can be based on the experiences and perceptions of the planning partners or on more sophisticated data collection efforts, and gaps in service;
- Strategies and/or activities to address identified gaps in service and achieve efficiencies in service delivery;
- Identification of coordination strategies to eliminate or reduce duplication in services and strategies for more efficient utilization of resources; and
- Relative priorities based on resources, time, and feasibility for implementing the specific strategies/activities identified (not required for the FY 2007-2011 Coordinated Plan).

An extensive public outreach component including a wide variety of organizations\(^2\) is required for the development of the Coordinated Plan. Specifically, the federal guidance states that the Coordinated Plan must be developed through a process that includes the representatives of public, private, and nonprofit transportation providers, as well as participation by members of the public. Furthermore, the guidelines stipulate that members of the public should include representatives of the targeted populations including individuals with disabilities, older adults, and people with low incomes. The guidance also recommends consultation with an expansive list of stakeholders throughout all phases of the Coordinated Plan development. A detailed assessment of the public involvement process conducted for the Coordinated Plan is included in Chapter 2.

1.4.2 State Requirements

The Local Transportation Fund (LTF) program of the TDA of the State of California provides a 0.25 percent state sales tax for operating and capital support of public transportation systems and nonmotorized transportation projects. SANDAG, as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA), is responsible for the allocation of TDA funds to the transit operators and the Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA). To determine the eligibility for continuous TDA funding, the RTPA must find that the transit operators are making a reasonable effort to improve their productivity. SANDAG achieves this by monitoring the identified TDA performance measures on a quarterly basis which are:

\(^2\) Organizations may include but are not limited to state, local officials and elected representatives/tribal governments, private/public/nonprofit/ADA transportation providers, human service agencies involved in transportation, taxi service providers, intercity bus operators, vanpools, flex car operators, business community/employers, economic development agencies, transit riders and potential riders, protection and advocacy organizations, agencies that administer employment or other support programs for targeted populations, faith-based and community-based organizations and school districts/colleges.
Operating Cost Per Passenger (Adjusted for Annual Inflation) – Measures Cost Effectiveness
Operating Cost Per Revenue Hour (Adjusted for Annual Inflation) – Measures Cost Efficiency
Passengers Per Revenue Hour – Measures Service Productivity
Passengers Per Revenue Mile – Measure Service Productivity
Revenue Hours Per Employee – Measures Labor Productivity
Farebox Recovery Ratio – Measures Service Cost Efficiency

A more thorough discussion of these measures is included in Chapters 3 and 4.

1.4.3 SANDAG Requirements

The Coordinated Plan fulfills the intent of SANDAG policies regarding transit service planning, such as Board Policy 18, which requires SANDAG to annually prepare a RSRTP that:

- Establishes the goals and objectives for short-range transit services;
- Defines the existing transit system;
- Sets the framework for a transit operations performance monitoring program as required by the TDA;
- Identifies service gaps and deficiencies;
- Evaluates existing services and programs;
- Establishes parameters for short-range (0-5 years) new and revised service development, as well as regionally significant and all other service adjustments;
- Defines a methodology for evaluating proposals for new and revised service;
- Identifies and prioritizes regional and subarea transit planning studies; and
- Evaluates and prioritizes new and revised services for implementation, including the adoption of an annual Regional Service Implementation Plan.

While the goals and objectives set forth in this report are aimed at fulfilling the requirements of SANDAG Board Policy 18, the federal requirement mandating the inclusion of human service transportation into the Coordinated Plan facilitates a more comprehensive approach and broadens the scope of the RSRTP components listed above.

1.5 Looking Forward

The combined RSRTP and Coordinated Plan provide a five-year outlook for public transportation in the region. The implementation of the Coordinated Plan will be the responsibility of the transit agencies and the other members of the transportation community. These organizations may apply for funding under the grant programs administered by SANDAG to fulfill projects identified and prioritized in the Coordinated Plan.

Within this overall framework, the role of the two local transit agencies, as defined by Policy 18, is also to address the objectives and performance monitoring program included in the RSRTP. This is achieved through the preparation of the annual Service Improvement Plan (SIP) which is incorporated into the RSRTP and prepared by MTS and NCTD to address annual service changes and improvements. However, due to the SPRINTER bus redesign and changes related to the MTS COA, the transit agencies have not been able to prepare the SIPs this year.
CHAPTER 2

COMMUNITY OUTREACH AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT
2 Community Outreach and Public Involvement

The following chapter provides a summary of the community outreach performed and the public involvement process used to develop the Coordinated Public Transit Human Services Transportation Plan. On September 6, 2006, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) released proposed guidance for the development and content of the Coordinated Plan along with the outreach strategies that should be used to develop it. This guidance outlines potential strategies for addressing the requirements set forth by the legislation, which states that a coordinated plan must be developed through a process that includes the representatives of public, private, and nonprofit transportation providers and participation by members of the public. Members of the public should include representatives of the targeted populations including individuals with disabilities, older adults, and people with low incomes. Plans must be developed in good faith in coordination with appropriate planning partners and with opportunities for public participation. The guidance recommends consultation with an expansive list of stakeholders throughout all phases of development of the Coordinated Plan using such tools as community planning sessions, focus groups, surveys, and detailed study and analysis.

To fulfill these requirements SANDAG employed multiple community outreach and public involvement techniques.

2.1 Community Outreach Efforts

Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Mini-Grant Workshops (December 2006)

To ensure diverse and extensive input into the 2007 RTP from residents throughout the San Diego region, SANDAG implemented an innovative program to secure participation from communities and individuals typically not involved in the regional transportation planning process. SANDAG awarded grant funding to community-based organizations through a competitive-bid process. The selected organizations conducted outreach activities to secure public involvement from stakeholders in their communities, engaged community-based participation in setting regional transportation priorities, and generated feedback on the RTP.

Seven non-profit agencies were selected to contract with SANDAG for this effort. These seven proposals demonstrated a commitment to working with diverse groups of residents and stakeholders to provide input at SANDAG committee meetings, workshops, and other outreach activities. Table 2.1 details the seven organizations that were selected and the specific communities they serve.
Table 2.1: RTP Mini-Grant Recipients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Community Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Bay Community Services</td>
<td>Chula Vista, Otay Ranch, South County Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able-Disabled Advocacy</td>
<td>People with Disabilities Throughout San Diego County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayside Community Center</td>
<td>Linda Vista Community Outreach to Seniors, and Communities That Speak Vietnamese, Chinese, and Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Heights CDC</td>
<td>Outreach to Residents in Greater City Heights Mid-City Communities That Include: Seniors, Low-Income, and Those Involved in Revitalizing These Neighborhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Congregations Together</td>
<td>Communities in the Southeastern Part of the City of San Diego and the Diamond Business District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon Collaborative</td>
<td>El Cajon/East County Community Members, Businesses, Schools, Social Service and Healthcare Providers, and Law Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido Education COMPACT</td>
<td>High School Youth Outreach in Escondido, San Marcos, and North Inland Areas. Will Include Youth in Outreach Effort to Solicit Input on Transportation Issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the portion of this outreach effort that occurred in December, the seven mini-grant recipients also collected comments to be used for the development of the Coordinated Plan. Strategies used by these organizations for soliciting input included community meetings, focus groups, and surveys with announcements made via public notices, flyers, newspapers, community publications, radio spots, e-mail lists, Web postings, or invitation letters.

Appendix A contains the RTP mini-grant community outreach comments from December 2006. Key issues brought up by the community groups centered around accessible public information, more frequent service, and additional hours of service.

Social Services Transportation Advisory Committee (SSTAC) Public Hearing

The Transportation Development Act (TDA) requires that jurisdictions that do not allocate all TDA funds to public transportation, specialized transportation, or bicycles and pedestrian transportation to hold at least one Unmet Needs Hearing if they wish to apply the money to other projects (e.g., roadways). The SSTAC is mandated by the California Public Utilities Code to participate in the Unmet Needs Hearings if they are held. In San Diego County, all TDA funds are currently being spent on transit service, including Paratransit and the Coordinated Transportation Service Agency (CTSA). However, the California Public Utilities Code also requires that SSTAC participates in “at least one public hearing in the jurisdiction represented by the SSTAC.” The purpose of the meeting is to solicit the input of transit-dependent and transit-disadvantaged persons, including seniors, persons with disabilities, and persons of limited means.
At the November 16, 2006, meeting, SSTAC approved holding two publicly noticed hearings to receive input from these populations to be used for the development of the Coordinated Plan, one in Northern San Diego County and one in Central San Diego County. The Act also includes a specific provision that requires 30 days’ notice in a newspaper of general circulation for the public hearing. Appendix A contains the public notice for this meeting along with the agenda, meeting summary, and public comments received.

Sub Regional Coordinated Plan Outreach Meetings

In addition to the public hearings sponsored by SSTAC, SANDAG held eight subregional Coordinated Plan Outreach Meetings. In order to solicit the most effective input for the purposes of the development of the Coordinated Plan, many of the meetings were open to invitees only. Four meetings were held for participation by representatives of health and human services agencies (HHSA), two in northern San Diego County and two in central San Diego County. One meeting was held in the central region of the county with the invitee list being composed of staff from the county and the cities in SANDAG’s jurisdiction. Two meetings were held for attendance by representatives of the school districts, and representatives of the transit agencies, one in each of the transit agencies jurisdictions. And finally, one outreach meeting was in the rural areas in which members of the public were invited along with representatives of agencies in the rural areas of the county.

Invitations were mailed out to 584 invitees for the seven outreach meetings. Of those, 514 were sent out to representatives at HHSAs. Additionally, invitation letters were sent out to the city managers and all the unified elementary and high school districts. Moreover, press releases appeared in all the regional newspapers for the public meetings. The rural meetings were intended to cover any interested parties in the rural areas and, therefore, the details of the rural meetings were included in the invitation that went out to all the health and human services agencies, and additionally, a public announcement appeared in the Julian Newspaper. Finally, a small article was included in the Aging & Independence Services newsletter, which included the meeting dates. Table 2.2 details the number of invitations that were sent out for each of the outreach meeting types.

Table 2.2: Number of Public Outreach Invitations Sent by Provider

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Invitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health and Human Service Agencies</td>
<td>514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Districts and Transit Operators</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities and San Diego County</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The outreach meetings commenced with a brief introduction explaining why the participants were invited to the meeting. Following this was a PowerPoint presentation that explained the Coordinated Plan, the purpose, the required elements, and the associated funding opportunities. Information about the Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA), Full Access & Coordinated Transportation (FACT) also was shared.
Appendix A contains copies of the four different outreach letters that were used, the affidavits of newspaper publishing, the list of organizations that received invitations, the sign-in sheets, and meeting summaries for the subregional outreach meetings, handouts of the PowerPoint slides that were used to introduce the Coordinated Plan at the outreach meetings, and the some of the maps of the demographic and transit related data that were used as visual aides at the outreach meetings. Several of the maps do not appear in Appendix A since they were enhanced and included in Chapter 5 of this document.

Surveys

The invitations that were sent to the health and human service agencies, the cities, and the county, contained a link to an online survey which they were asked to fill out. Additionally, a letter was sent out to private providers of transportation and tribal governments requesting they fill out a similar survey. The private providers were not invited to public meetings because, as private businesses, it is unlikely that they would have been willing to discuss their operations in front of their competitors. 628 letters were sent out asking recipients to fill out the online survey, and a total of 55 surveys were returned for an 8.75 percent response rate. Appendix A contains a copy of the survey form that was used.

Tribal Outreach

Tribal representatives were first introduced to the Coordinated Planning process via a presentation at the Interagency Technical Working Group on Tribal Transportation Issues meeting at Rincon reservation on February 6, 2007. Another presentation was given to a smaller group of tribal representatives at a Tribal Transit Feasibility Study Focus Group Meeting at San Pasqual Reservation on Wednesday, March 7, 2007. Finally, the Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association was introduced to the topic at their meeting on Tuesday, March 20, 2007. Immediately following that presentation, a letter was sent to the 17 federally recognized tribes in San Diego County, the Southern California Tribal Chairmen’s Association, and the Southern Indian Health Council requesting they fill out a survey. Three surveys were returned for a 15.79 percent response rate.

2.2 Public and Stakeholder Involvement

In addition to the outreach meetings that were held to gather input for the Coordinated Plan, SANDAG made sure the stakeholders and members of the public were constantly involved in the process of developing the Coordinated Plan.

SSTAC Coordinated Plan Adhoc Committee

In order to ensure consistent participation in the development by stakeholders and members of the public in the Coordinated Plan, an SSTAC Coordinated Plan Adhoc Committee was formed. This committee met regularly throughout the process. On November 13, 2006, members of SSTAC were informed that guidance released by FTA outlines potential strategies for addressing the requirements set forth by the legislation. The guidance recommended consultation with an expansive list of stakeholders throughout all phases of the development of the Coordinated Plan. The FTA suggested community planning sessions as one means of increasing public involvement. SANDAG staff recommended recurring, regularly scheduled community planning sessions in the form of a Coordinated Plan Adhoc Group. The composition of this group includes:
a. One representative of potential transit users who is a person of limited means
b. One representative of potential transit users who is 60 years of age or older*
c. One representative of potential transit users who is a person with a disability*
d. Two representatives of local social service providers for seniors, including one representative of a social service transportation provider*
e. Two representatives of local social service providers for persons with disabilities, including one representative of a social service transportation provider*
f. Two representatives of local social service providers for persons of limited means, including one representative of a social service transportation provider*
g. Two representatives from the local CTSA with one CTSA member representing the North County Transit District (NCTD) service area and the other CTSA member representing the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) service area*
h. One representative from NCTD representing fixed-route service
i. One representative from NCTD representing Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) service
j. One representative from MTS representing fixed-route service
k. One representative from MTS representing ADA service

*Membership categories currently represented on SSTAC

Due to the overlap in representation between SSTAC and the proposed Coordinated Plan Adhoc Group, SANDAG staff recommended that the members of SSTAC serve on this committee. All members of SSTAC agreed to serve on the Coordinated Plan Adhoc Group and additional members were recruited to fill the appropriate membership categories that were not already represented on SSTAC. The group met monthly beginning on January 16, 2007. Appendix A contains the Coordinated Plan Adhoc Group agendas and meeting minutes.

Public Comment Period

SANDAG’s Public Participation/Involvement Policy establishes a process for obtaining input from, and providing information to, the public concerning agency programs, projects, and program funding in order to ensure the public is informed, as well as has the opportunity to provide SANDAG with input so plans can reflect the public’s desire. In accordance with this policy, any changes to, or creation of, new transit service plans must be available in draft form for public review 15 days before the final report is taken to SANDAG’s Transportation Committee for approval. Comments received for the Coordinated Plan within this 15-day comment period are taken into account and reflected in the final document.

2.3 Prior Outreach and Public Involvement Efforts

In the development of the Coordinated Plan, SANDAG used the results of studies and surveys that had been conducted recently including the Older Adult Transportation Needs Survey, the Welfare to Work Study, and the Social Services Transportation Inventory.
Older Adult Transportation Needs Survey

SANDAG conducted a survey in 2006 to learn more about the transportation needs of older adult transportation agency clients in the San Diego region. The survey was only intended to represent older adults who currently use agency services and was not intended to represent all older adults in the San Diego region.

The survey was sent by mail to over 24,000 agency service clients age 60 years and older throughout the county. The mailing garnered 2,354 completed surveys for a 9.6 percent response rate.

The 2006 Older Adult Transportation Needs Survey form contained eleven questions, most of which had multiple parts. The questions fell into three broad categories: questions about the respondent, questions about typical transportation needs, and questions about specific transportation services.

This survey was taken as an information item to the Transportation Committee on December 8, 2006, and to SSTAC on January 16, 2007. The staff report that was included in the agenda item is available in Appendix A. The results of the survey also are included in the needs assessment chapter of this plan (Chapter 7). The full report is available upon request.

Welfare to Work Study

The 2003 Welfare to Work Transit Study, funded through a Caltrans Environmental Justice planning grant, identifies the unmet transportation needs of participants of California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs), a welfare program that gives cash aid and services to eligible needy California families. The study outlined transit service improvements to help make public transit more usable to low-income and CalWORKs communities, as a basis for future funding consideration and service improvements. The scope of work included an assessment of unmet transit needs and service deficiencies, and the development of service improvement proposals to address those needs.

A Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC), comprised of County Health and Human Services (HHS) staff, childcare and employment representation, transit agency staff, and CalWORKs participants was established to provide input throughout the study process and to review deliverables and final recommendations. The assessment of transportation needs of CalWORKs participants was conducted through the analysis of origins and destinations data for CalWORKs participants, focus groups with CalWORKs participants, and discussions with the SAC. Once the transportation needs were identified, existing transit services were assessed. Based on the transportation needs and service assessment, gaps and deficiencies in transit service related to CalWORKs and low-income communities were identified. These gaps and deficiencies act as obstacles to transit usage, and can be temporal, geographic, service quality, and informational in nature.

The gaps and deficiencies that were identified in the study were used as input in the Coordinated Plan. The list of comments taken from these reports is available in Appendix A. A Full copy of the Welfare to Work Study is available at www.sandag.org/uploads/publicationid/publicationid_942_4849.pdf. Where applicable, the results of the study are included in the needs assessment chapter of this plan (Chapter 7).
Social Services Transportation Inventory

SANDAG prepared a 2006 Social Service Transportation Inventory. This inventory lists the Social Service Agencies in the San Diego Region that provide transportation services and includes a brief analysis of services provided, eligibility requirements, vehicle inventory, and operational costs/funding. The results of the inventory identifies current social service transportation providers, recipients being served, trip purposes, funding, and other administrative issues related to the establishment of coordination and the consolidation of services.

In the fall of 2005, the transportation inventory survey was distributed to local social service agencies listed with both the United Way of San Diego County and the Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA). The resulting inventory is a compilation of all data received by the 120 responding agencies. This inventory was used to help develop the assessment of available services that identifies current social service transportation providers, a required element in the Coordinated Plan.

The social service transportation inventory is provided in Appendix D and the services are included in the needs assessment chapter of this plan (Chapter 7).

Unmet Transit Needs Hearings

Although SSTAC did not hold Unmet Transit Needs hearings in FY 2007, opting instead to hold public hearings to receive input for the Coordinated Plan, Unmet Needs hearings have traditionally been held in previous years. Comments from Unmet Needs hearings in 2004 and 2005 were used for the development of the Coordinated Plan.

2.4 Comments Received

This figure reflects the percentage of comments received through all outreach efforts to illustrate the frequency of mention for each type of transportation need.
**Figure 2.1: Categories of Comments Received**

Since Public Transit Service was the most frequently mentioned transportation need, the category has been broken down further to more specifically reflect the types of needs.

**Figure 2.2 Sub-Categories of Public Transit Comments Received:**
The next figure reflects the percentage of comments received by source from the Coordinated Plan Public Outreach Meetings, Surveys, Welfare to Work Study, Unmet Needs Hearings, and the RTP Outreach. The majority of the comments came from the surveys completed by the following groups: health and human service providers, private providers, seniors, cities, and the County of San Diego.

**Figure 2.3: Public Comment Sources**

All of the comments received via the different outreach methods are listed in Appendix A.
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PUBLIC AND HUMAN SERVICE TRANSPORTATION VISION
3 Public and Human Service Transportation Vision

One of the purposes of this plan is to meld the visions and missions of the four local transportation agencies into a coordinated transportation approach for San Diego County. These agencies include:

- SANDAG,
- Metropolitan Transit System (MTS),
- North County Transit District (NCTD); and
- Full Access & Coordinated Transportation (FACT)

NCTD and MTS are transit operators. FACT was appointed to serve as the Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA) in 2006. FACT is a special purpose agency dedicated to improving, consolidating, and coordinating health and human service transportation in the region and SANDAG is the regional transportation planning agency with specific responsibilities for long-and short-range transit planning. Each agency has defined a distinct mission and/or vision.

3.1 Agency Missions/Visions

The Mission of the North County Transit District is:

“To deliver safe, convenient, reliable, and user-friendly public transportation services. Our vision is to build an integrated transit system that enables our customers to travel easily and efficiently throughout our growing region. “

We will achieve this by:

- “Placing service to our customers first,
- Ensuring the safety and security of our employees and customers,
- Delivering high quality transit services,
- Developing and maintaining facilities that sustain and promote current and future transportation services,
- Securing adequate revenue, protecting our assets, and getting the maximum return on the public investment,
- Working in partnership with our communities and other stakeholders, and
- Encouraging innovation, creativity, and leadership.”

The Vision for MTS services is to:

- “Develop a customer-focused system: provide services that reflect the travel needs and priorities of our customers,
- Develop a competitive system: provide services that are competitive with other travel options by meeting market segment expectations,
- Develop an integrated system: develop transit services as part of an integrated network rather than a collection of individual routes, and
- Develop a sustainable system: provide appropriate types and levels of service that are consistent with market demands and are maintainable under current financial conditions.”
The Vision for FACT is:

“That all people living in San Diego County will have full mobility within their community through an accessible transportation system that meets their individual needs. The Mission of FACT is to create a transportation system that will provide access and mobility for all people in San Diego County by:

- Coordinating existing resources,
- Creating partnerships that eliminate barriers,
- Accessing additional sources of funding,
- Augmenting existing resources, and
- Developing alternative models of transportation.”

The SANDAG Mission Statement is:

“SANDAG serves as the forum for regional decision-making. SANDAG builds consensus, makes strategic plans, obtains and allocates resources, plans, engineers, and builds public transit, and provides information on a broad range of topics pertinent to the region's quality of life.”

SANDAG prepares the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The current plan, MOBILITY 2030, contains an integrated set of public policies, strategies, and investments to maintain, manage, and improve the transportation system in the San Diego region through the year 2030. The Plan’s vision for transportation supports the region’s comprehensive strategy to promote smarter, more sustainable growth. The MOBILITY 2030 vision focuses on the development of a flexible transportation system that focuses on moving people and goods – not just vehicles. The vision is to provide more convenient, fast, and safe travel choices for public transit, ridesharing, walking, biking, private vehicles, and freight. It commits the region to preserve its existing transportation resources and manage the regional transportation system efficiently. A new RTP is now under development and is scheduled for completion later in 2007.

At the core of MOBILITY 2030 are seven goals:

- Mobility – Improve the mobility of people and freight,
- Accessibility – Improve accessibility to major employment and other regional activity centers,
- Reliability – Improve the reliability and safety of the transportation system,
- Efficiency – Maximize the efficiency of the existing and future transportation system,
- Livability – Promote livable communities,
- Sustainability – Minimize effects on the environment, and
- Equity – Ensure an equitable distribution of the benefits among various demographic and user groups.

Based on this vision and the seven policy goals, a Regional Transit Vision (RTV) was developed. The vision was developed by SANDAG, MTS, NCTD, Caltrans, local jurisdictions, and a 50-member Citizens Advisory Committee for Transportation. In 2001, SANDAG and the two transit agencies adopted the RTV, setting in place the framework for transit improvements in MOBILITY 2030. The
RTV calls for a network of fast, flexible, reliable, safe, and convenient transit services that connect our homes to the region’s major employment activity centers. The RTV was the basis for the project list provided in the TransNet Extension and Ordinance, which was approved by the voters in 2004.

MOBILITY 2030 identifies the transit improvements that have the highest priority for the region. The identified services will help to boost transit ridership and help achieve a double-digit transit mode share along key corridors during peak periods. The identified services fulfill a variety of network functions, but particularly offer competitive travel times to major job centers.

The role of the Coordinated Plan will be to further refine the list of projects which identify the services that can be implemented over the next five years within the context of available funding and other service changes desired by SANDAG, MTS, NCTD, and the CTSA. The Coordinated Plan introduces human services transportation into regional transportation planning and allows the consideration of new strategies and projects to be considered as part of a coordinated approach to developing transportation solutions.

3.2 RSRTP Coordinated Transportation Approach

A Passenger-Centered Focus

This plan provides for a passenger-centered approach to short-range transportation planning issues. This means that the plan is focused on identifying the needs of users, the required levels of service and mobility opportunities that should be provided for residents and visitors to San Diego, rather than developing specific operational strategies to solve the issues. Operational planning to meet the regional goals and objectives remains the responsibility of MTS, NCTD, and the CTSA.
CHAPTER 4

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND MONITORING
4  Goals, Objectives, and Monitoring

4.1  GOALS AND OBJECTIVES - MANAGING WHAT YOU CAN MEASURE

Purpose

This Passenger-Centered, Coordinated Plan has been specifically prepared to provide a policy framework in order to establish goals and objectives to implement and measure the public and human service transportation network in San Diego County. The policy framework also will help allow SANDAG to more carefully evaluate transit performance as required by the Transportation Development Act (TDA) and human service transportation as required by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). This plan provides a way forward so that a more comprehensive analysis of transit service from the regional and passenger perspectives can be performed in future years as more detailed data becomes available from new technologies. These technological advancements include automatic vehicle location systems (AVL), automatic passenger counters (APCs) and smartcards (Compass Card). On the human service side the plan identifies the performance measures for human services transportation and provides the baseline against which performance will be evaluated in the future.

This plan marks the first time that any attempt has been made to inventory and evaluate the provision of health and human service transportation in San Diego County. The sections of this plan dealing with performance issues and service gaps will continue to expand as further experience and knowledge is developed in these areas. This plan is a first step in developing a better understanding of the challenges facing this important transportation sector.

Transit

The monitoring of transit performance provides a tool to annually assess the overall health of the regional public transit system. The general approach for developing transit system goals and objectives was presented and approved by the SANDAG Transportation Committee on November 4, 2005. The approach includes guidelines to be used where the requirement is a SANDAG policy objective and targets where the objective related to state or federal regulations or legislation. The guidelines presented in this report are based on a 5-year service objective, which can be adjusted on an annual basis, as needed, depending on changing conditions such as available funding, the cost of energy, the health of the local economy, or any other related condition. The guidelines may be changed to reflect changes in funding levels or from a desire to adjust service levels. On the other hand, the identified targets are based on requirements established by state and federal legislation or regulations.
The objectives provide quantifiable outcomes for each goal and indicators define how SANDAG will measure each objective. The guidelines and targets can then be used to identify deficiencies or service gaps as required by SANDAG Policy 18, Regional Transit Service Planning and Implementation. Specific service deficiencies or gaps will be addressed in the Service Improvement Plans (SIPs) which the transit agencies are required to prepare. These SIPs will normally be included as part of the Regional Short Range Transit Plan (RSRTP). However, due to the SPRINT service/bus redesign and changes related to the Metropolitan Transit system Comprehensive Operations Analysis (MTS COA), the transit agencies have not been able to prepare the SIPs this year.

Care has been taken to identify objectives which can easily be quantified and indicators which can be objectively measured with existing or proposed data sources. Should the development of new transportation funding sources arise, the evaluation of transit service performance may enable the justification for the programming of future funds for transit given the evaluation of actual quantitative performance data.

The goals and objectives influence the design and quality of the transit service and implement the transit vision of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The actual implementation and service design remain the responsibility of the operating agencies. These policy goals and objectives would be applied across the entire county, while the performance indicators and guidelines would be tailored to specific environments. The guidelines will provide clarity for decision makers and the public regarding the level of transit service proposed to be provided regionally and will help people make decisions on where to locate their residence, place of employment, choose a school or location for their business or institution making this a passenger-centered plan.

The transit objectives will be based on sub-regional areas that group similar geographic or demographic areas without reference to individual routes, services or transit operators. These objectives all relate to the goals of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP), the Regional Transportation Plan, or have consistently been tracked through the annual TDA performance improvement program. The passenger-centered transit objectives will address:

- Productivity
- Ridership
- Access
- Convenience
- Reliability
- Service Speed
- Environmental Justice

The State of California has specific financial and effectiveness performance indicators that also must be measured. These statistics will be collected and reviewed quarterly to ensure ongoing monitoring of system performance. They include:

- Financial performance (farebox recovery)
- Operating cost per passenger (adjusted for annual inflation)
- Operating cost per revenue hour (adjusted for annual inflation)
- Passengers per revenue hour
- Passengers per revenue mile
- Revenue hours per employee
This report also includes data sets reported in prior years in order to ensure statistical continuity between previous Regional Short-Range Transit Plans and future Coordinated Plans. It is anticipated that in future plans this data set will be improved and expanded as new data from automated sources becomes available and expanded to encompass human service transportation.

**Human Services**

In the past SANDAG has had a very limited role in human service transportation. SANDAG coordinates the local process for awarding FTA Section 5310 money for elderly and disabled transportation. SANDAG has also served as the Coordinated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA) for San Diego County and as the CTSA participated in some coordination strategies such as the STRIDE (Specialized Transportation Referral & Information for the Disabled and Elderly) Web site and coordinated training programs for human service operators. However, as a result of Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), SANDAG has been given the responsibility to develop a Coordinated Plan and to provide grant money to agencies providing human service transportation.

The federal government has identified a total of five performance measures for the New Freedom (NF) and JARC human service transportation programs. In this first Coordinated Plan, the emphasis will be on understanding these indicators and developing a strategy to collect the information as the programs begin implementation following the 2006 competitive process. As with the transit performance objectives, the purpose of these measures is to look at the performance of the overall program, not specific grants or services.
4.2 The Coordinated Plan Service Model

The Coordinated Plan must integrate the Transit Vision of MOBILITY 2030, the Smart Growth objectives of the RCP, the short-term service objectives of the MTS COA and North County Transit District’s (NCTD’s) Fast Forward. Services in each development area (Urban Zone, Suburban Zone, and Rural Zone) will be designed based on guidelines for each of the three service tiers (Urban Network Services, Commuter Services, and Community Based Services), using the Transit First family of transit services as the building blocks (Regional Service [Yellow Car], Corridor Service [Red Car], Local Bus [Blue Car], and Community Bus [Green Car]). The relationships among these three elements and the Smart Growth land use planning program are shown in Figure 4.1. Human service transportation operates in all service areas, serving passengers in need. The greatest concentration of human service transportation providers may be found in the urban zones.

4.3 Coordinated Plan Goals and Objectives

4.3.1 Goals

A series of nine overall goals for the coordinated transportation network in San Diego were developed based on the visions of the four agencies (MTS, NCTD, CTSA, and SANDAG) involved in planning and operation of the transportation system.
1. To provide an accessible transit network in the urban areas that offers frequency and span of service to support spontaneous use for a wide range of needs,
2. To provide an accessible transit network in the suburban areas that offers direct service along commute corridors with critical mass featuring rapid, frequent service during peaks with seamless coordinated transfers, and local service focused on smart growth areas and lifeline needs,
3. To provide accessible lifeline public and human service transportation in rural areas,
4. To maximize the farebox recovery rate and ensure that operation of the transit system is fiscally responsible,
5. To offer accessible public and human service transportation services that are productive, coordinated, convenient and appropriate for the markets being served,
6. To offer accessible public and human service transportation services in San Diego that are reliable and offer competitive travel times to major destinations,
7. To offer accessible public and human service transportation services that support the smart growth policies as outlined in the RCP,
8. To offer accessible public and human service transportation services in San Diego without discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin or disability, and
9. To enhance the mobility choices of the transportation disadvantaged by improving coordination and developing alternative models of transportation.

The Coordinated Plan goals and objectives will be measured at a regional or subregional basis with a focus on service to passenger (passenger-centered plan). MTS and NCTD will have more detailed procedures for the analysis of routes and segments to fulfill their service design and performance measurement requirements. Policy 18 provides that the goals and objectives in the RSRTP/Coordinated Plan offer policy guidance, while the transit operators are responsible for implementation and operations.

4.3.2 Service Zones

San Diego County was divided into three distinct types of service zones based on land use, demographics and travel behaviors in order to more carefully evaluate transit service in these zones. These three zones are: Urban, Suburban, and Rural. The map in Figure 4.2 shows the boundaries of each zone. The objectives, indicators, and guidelines or targets provide policy direction to the two transit agencies as they implement service to ensure that it is provided efficiently, effectively, and equitably across the entire service area. The objectives and indicators usually apply across all zones, but the guidelines will generally vary by zone reflecting the different needs and markets in the Urban, Suburban, and Rural zones.

There are two Urban Zones in San Diego County, as shown in Figure 4.2. The largest Urban Zone is located in the MTS service area, extending from University City on the north to Imperial Beach in the south, and from the coast east to El Cajon. The second Urban Zone follows the SPRINTER Corridor in the NCTD service area and includes parts of Oceanside, Escondido, Carlsbad, Vista, and San Marcos. The Urban Zones are characterized by two key factors that support high levels of transit service: higher density, transit-oriented land uses (residential, commercial, industrial, institutional), and good access to transit via a network of arterial and collector roadways. A rich transit network in this zone should be provided, designed to allow for spontaneous use for a wide range of destinations and trip needs throughout the day.
The Suburban Zone area surrounds each of the two Urban Zones. The Suburban Zone is characterized by low-density development and street patterns that make access to transit difficult. These areas may include some smart growth development, including pockets of transit-oriented residential, commercial, and institutional uses; however, the overall development pattern is not transit friendly. The result is that spontaneous transit use would be difficult to achieve even if a high level of service were to be provided. Thus, transit services in the suburban zone are best oriented towards providing peak period commuter services, linkages to major destinations in key travel corridors, and community based services tailored to individual community needs. Providing park and ride facilities will be needed to maximize access to the peak-period commuter services.

The Rural Zone extends from the eastern edge of the Suburban Zone into the backcountry areas. The limited transit services are designed to maintain lifeline access to rural villages.

The zones were initially developed to support planning for public transportation; however, in the future they also may become a useful tool in planning for human service transportation. It may become necessary in the future to use the zones as means of prioritizing human service transportation needs and expenditures. For example, it seems unlikely that the region will be able to provide the same level of human service transportation services and mobility choices for people living in rural areas as for those people who are living in urban areas.
Figure 4.2 - Service Zones
4.3.3 Transit Objectives

The objectives outlined below are designed to provide the quantifiable outcomes for each of the transit related goals discussed in the previous section. There is limited use of actual measured data for illustrative purposes since virtually all services in the MTS service area were redesigned in FY 2007 for the COA. Similarly, almost all of the services offered by NCTD in North County will be redesigned to coincide with the opening of the SPRINTER in December 2007. In future years, the objectives will be measured with current data, and the current level of service being offered to residents and visitors will be used to identify deficiencies and service gaps.

Financial Objective

This objective addresses Goal No. 4 (maximizing the farebox recovery rate and ensuring fiscally responsible operations). The cost recovery goal and objective provides an evaluation of the financial health of the systems and their continued eligibility for state financial support. This objective has a target, rather than a guideline as SANDAG is required by the TDA to establish firm cost recovery targets for MTS and NCTD. The cost recovery indicator helps to determine the appropriateness of the fare structure and the ability of the system to generate ridership and revenue. The TDA of the State of California requires that MTS generate a cost recovery of at least 31.9 percent for all services except the Commuter Express Service which must achieve a 20 percent cost recovery. The cost recovery of the entire MTS systems is about 37 percent.

Under the TDA, NCTD must achieve a minimum cost recovery of 18.8 percent for all services. Based on this goal a single objective was developed also that would respond to the specific requirements of the TDA of California. The current cost recovery of the entire NCTD systems is about 25 percent.

Objective: For each transit agency to meet or exceed the minimum TDA target for farebox cost recovery

TDA Indicator: Percentage of operating costs recovered from fare revenue for fixed-route and demand responsive services

Target:  
- MTS: 32% - 38%  
- MTS Commuter Express: To Be Determined  
- NCTD: 19% - 25%
Growth Objectives

In San Diego, ridership growth has traditionally been measured against growth in population. This is now expanded to include measuring the growth in transit ridership against the change in employment and the growth in the number of vehicle registrations. In 2007, transit ridership growth countywide outpaced population growth, growth in employment, and the growth rate of vehicle registrations. The comparison against job growth is particularly important as more workers live in Riverside County and the Republic of Mexico. The need to growing transit ridership is a corollary to the growth of service as provided in the RTP. In addition, many existing services do have additional capacity to handle more riders at no additional costs; however, much of the capacity is in the off peak direction. To take advantage of this capacity may require land use change and significant Transit Oriented Development (TOD) which is beyond the direct control of SANDAG and the transit operators.

**Objective:** The ridership for each transit agency shall grow faster than the rate of growth in population, jobs, and private vehicle registrations within their service area

**Indicator:** Percentage rate of growth in transit ridership by operator

**Guideline:** Growth rate to be greater than the growth rate of population and of employment by transit service area; and growth rate of vehicle registrations for the County

Productivity Objective

This objective addresses Transit Goal 5 (operating productive services that also are convenient and appropriate for the market being served). In order to meet this goal an objective was developed to measure productivity and to judge whether or not appropriate levels of service are being provided. Separate guidelines have been established for each service type to reflect differing expectations. A guideline was chosen instead of a target as this is a SANDAG policy objective, rather than a state or federal requirement.
Objective: To operate transit services that are productive, convenient, and appropriate for the markets being served

Indicator 1: Average annual revenue passengers per revenue service hour by operator

Target: MTS 35 – 37 revenue passenger boardings per service hour  
NCTD 20 – 22 revenue passenger boardings per service hour

Indicator 2: Average percentage of seats occupied (load factor)

Guideline:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peak Period</td>
<td>Weekdays All Day</td>
<td>Peak Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>25 - 30%</td>
<td>20 - 25%</td>
<td>20 - 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>45 - 50%</td>
<td>40 - 45%</td>
<td>20 - 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Bus</td>
<td>25 - 30%</td>
<td>20 - 25%</td>
<td>15 - 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Bus</td>
<td>25 - 30%</td>
<td>20 - 25%</td>
<td>15 - 20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Productivity is a measure of how well ‘products’ are being utilized by passengers. The major ‘product’ produced by a transit service is available seat miles. One seat mile is one seat on a bus traveling one mile. One low-floor transit bus produces 38 available seat miles when it is driven one mile. Any means of measuring productivity should, therefore, evaluate how many of the available seat miles that are being produced, are actually used or consumed by passengers. High consumption is an indication that a product is attractive to passengers, low productivity suggests that passengers do not find the service attractive. Load factor, or passenger miles divided by available seat miles, measures this productivity. Load factor is commonly used in other transportation industries such as commercial aviation to assess productivity and how well a carrier matches supply and demand. It is usually expressed as a percentage, although it also can be stated as a ratio. The difference between peak and off peak productivity is relatively small as the number of available seat miles (capacity) is generally reduced in off peak periods to better balance supply and demand. Peak period productivity may be higher as some trips may include standees.

Load factor provides a passenger centric means of evaluating productivity and the attractiveness of service. Transit productivity also is impacted by non-productive time resulting from deadhead, layovers, and operator makeup time (time for which drivers are paid, but are not driving) which means that load factor may be a less valuable measurement for analyzing specific routes. MTS and NCTD will need to continue to look at other more detailed measurement techniques to determine potential service adjustments at the route or route segment level.

Calculating a load factor for a transit service has some similarity to a capacity analysis for a roadway. Both roads and transit services are well utilized during peak periods, but when measured over an entire operating day, the capacity utilization is much less. Transit systems reduce capacity or headway during off peak hours to keep their load factors from falling too low. Roads, as fixed facilities can not usually reduce capacity in off peak hours. In urban areas, transit services that
manage an overall daily load factor average of at least 20 percent are doing well. A typical urban arterial, such as Balboa Avenue in San Diego, El Camino Real in North County, and H Street in Chula Vista also have a typical all-day capacity utilization rate by all vehicles of about 20 percent. Sample capacity calculations for these arterial roadways are provided in Appendix G.

The passengers per revenue service hour criteria is included as a measurement of productivity and is also one of the required performance measures included in the California Transportation Development Act. Similar to the load factor indicator, evaluating passengers per revenue hour provides a general indication of how well resources are being utilized.

One of the impacts of the lower productivity rate for rural services is the need to charge higher fares on rural routes in order to reflect the longer distances traveled and to achieve the cost recovery target.

**Access Objectives**

Transit access can involve issues such as walking distance to a bus stop, the provision of wheelchair lifts or ramps, and the provision of complementary Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) dial-a-ride service. Three goals (5, 7, and 8) cover these policy aspects of the transit service. The access objectives identify guidelines on how far people must walk or drive to access transit, as well as linking transit accessibility to the smart growth program of SANDAG. Accessibility targets have been established for bus stops as the requirements are federally mandated. However, it is understood that the transit operators may not actually be responsible for all bus stops. In some cities, the responsibility for providing accessible stops lies with the municipal government. However, this objective is provided here to be consistent with the passenger-centered focus of this plan and to ensure that this indicator is tracked and the appropriate authorities are reminded of their responsibilities.

**Objective 1:** In urban areas, transit and land use development should ensure a comfortable walking distance to transit for residents and jobs

**Indicator:** Distance of residents or jobs from a bus stop or rail station in urban areas

**Guideline:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Urban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>60 - 70% within ¼ mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>60 - 70% within ¼ mile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objective 2: In urban areas, transit and land use development should ensure that in suburban areas residents should be within a reasonable distance of a park and ride facility with access to the transit network and transit services should be provided to existing or planned smart growth areas

Indicator: Percent of suburban residences within a specific distance of a park and ride facility with regional or corridor services

Guideline: 80 percent of residents in suburban areas within five miles of a park and ride lot served by regional and corridor services

Indicator: Distance of residents or jobs from a bus stop or rail station in suburban areas

Guideline:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Suburban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>70 - 88% within 1 mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>75 - 88% within 1 mile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objective 3: Transit service should be designed to support Smart Growth

Indicator: Transit service should be designed to support the smart growth areas located on the SANDAG Smart Growth Concept Map

Guideline: 100 percent of planned and existing smart growth areas shown on the Smart Growth Concept Map served by transit meeting smart growth guidelines

Objective 4: Transit to maintain existing lifeline services to currently identified rural village smart growth areas

Indicator: Number of days per week with at least one return trip to destinations from rural villages identified on the Smart Growth Concept Map

Guideline: One return trip provided at least two days per week for rural villages identified on the Smart Growth Concept Map

Objective 5: To provide fully accessible bus stops and transit stations

Indicator: Percentage of bus stops and transit stations that are fully accessible

Target: 100 percent of bus stops and transit stations meeting ADA accessibility requirements
The current transit services were measured against the access guidelines for urban and suburban areas (see Tables 4.1 and 4.2). The networks that were analyzed were prior to the COA changes for MTS and before the proposed changes for the SPRINTER are implemented for NCTD. The data does give a general idea where these guidelines are being met or not met and how well the urban and suburban areas in San Diego County are being served. The expectation is, that over the next five years, funds will be available to improve service and meet these guidelines. In future Coordinated Plans, these calculations will be redone based on the updated networks and the information used to identify service gaps. The data does show that the two operators provide similar levels of service in similar service zones. NCTD generally provides better access to jobs, while MTS generally provides better access to residential areas.

The proposed walking distance guidelines in the urban and suburban areas of San Diego are more conservative than in most cities. The topography of hills and ravines and the discontinuous road network make achieving better access cost prohibitive.

Table 4.1: Urban and Suburban Access Guidelines and 2005 Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MTS (based on pre COA network)</th>
<th>Percentage Population</th>
<th>Percentage Jobs</th>
<th>Guideline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban 1/4-Mile</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>60.0 - 70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2-Mile</td>
<td>91.4%</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Mile</td>
<td>98.7%</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Miles</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban 1/4-Mile</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2-Mile</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Mile</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
<td>70.0 – 88.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Miles</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
<td>96.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCTD (based on pre-SPRINTER network)</th>
<th>Percentage Population</th>
<th>Percentage Jobs</th>
<th>Guideline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban 1/4-Mile</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>60.0 - 70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2-Mile</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>93.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Mile</td>
<td>97.8%</td>
<td>99.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Miles</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban 1/4-Mile</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2-Mile</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Mile</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
<td>70.0 – 88.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Miles</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2: Suburban Access to Park and Ride Guidelines and Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Suburban Population Within 5 Miles of Park &amp; Ride</th>
<th>Suburban Population</th>
<th>% Within 5 Miles</th>
<th>Guideline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>520,021</td>
<td>654,121</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>75.0 – 85.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>250,595</td>
<td>331,448</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td>75.0 – 85.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Walking distance to a bus stop is one of the major determinants of transit usage. The closer a bus stop is to a person’s point of origin or destination, the more likely they are to choose transit. Several research studies in the U.S. and Canada have shown that about half of all transit passengers walk less than 750 feet to a bus stop. The graph in Figure 4.3 illustrates the results of this research.

The topography of hills and canyons in San Diego County means that the street network is discontinuous and pedestrian routes are often interrupted by geographic barriers. Therefore, it is very difficult to provide good transit coverage, even in many parts of the urban zones. This means the guidelines are relatively conservative. Smart growth will encourage future population growth to occur near transit stops which should increase the percentage living within the specified distance. The land use change will be a slow process.

Many transit systems have guidelines or standards for walking distances between stops and residences, fewer systems have guidelines in place for walking distance between stops and destinations. The proposed guideline recognizes that employment is a major generator of transit trips. Focusing the guideline on employment reinforces the role of the transit system as supporting economic activity and access to jobs.

Convenience Objectives

Five of the nine goals for transit in the region relate to developing a transit system that is convenient for users and potential users. Goals 1, 2, 3, and 5 all relate to convenience yet also note that different levels of service are appropriate for different markets or zones.

Objective 1:  To provide an appropriate span of service to bus stops based on the zone designation

Indicator: Percentage of stops provided with service within specified timeframes for each zone designation

Guideline:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekday</td>
<td>70 - 80% of stops; 6:00 – 23:00</td>
<td>60 - 70% of stops; 7:00 – 23:00</td>
<td>40 - 50% of stops; 8:00 - 21:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>60 - 70% of stops; 8:00 - 21:00</td>
<td>50 - 60% of stops; 7:00 – 23:00</td>
<td>1 round trip per day, 2 days per week allowing minimum 4 hour stay in city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>50 - 60% of stops; 6:00 – 23:00</td>
<td>50 - 60% of stops; 7:00 – 23:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objective 2: To provide frequency appropriate for spontaneous travel on major corridors and convenient travel to all parts of the urban core

Indicator: Minimum headways expressed in minutes

Guideline:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Urban Services</th>
<th>Suburban Services</th>
<th>Rural Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peak</td>
<td>Off Peak</td>
<td>Peak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Rail</td>
<td>20 - 30</td>
<td>60 - 120</td>
<td>20 - 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Bus</td>
<td>15 - 20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15 - 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>15 - 20</td>
<td>15 - 20</td>
<td>15 - 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Bus</td>
<td>15 - 30</td>
<td>30 - 60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Bus</td>
<td>30 - 60</td>
<td>30 - 60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The span of service guidelines define the times that transit service will be provided. For the Urban Zone, the objective is to ensure that service is convenient and can accommodate travel during most hours of the day. Users need a clearly defined span of service in order to be able to plan regular travel (e.g., employment trips), as well as spontaneous trips. People need to know when transit will be available in order to make decisions on where to live and where to work and the availability of transportation for other potential trips.

In the Suburban Zone, the emphasis is on providing excellent commuter services in major corridors, backed up with a limited network of lifeline services. In the rural areas the policy objectives and guidelines only contemplate lifeline levels of service. The MTS and NCTD Boards of Directors also may decide to provide higher levels of service in specific areas where there are special or unique markets to be served.

The frequency of service also influences people’s modal choice. The Urban Core is the area that requires and can support a high level of frequency that will enable passengers to travel spontaneously. The COA has developed an extensive network of routes with headways of 15 minutes or better in the Urban Zone. Experience in San Diego and elsewhere shows that better headways almost always result in more riders.

The minimum regional service headways are set at 15 minutes for bus and 20 minutes for rail consistent with RTP. This recognizes of the high cost of reducing rail headways below 20 minutes.

Reliability and Speed Objectives

Reliability and speed are very important to existing and prospective transit users. Goal 6 recognizes the importance of reliability and maintaining or improving travel times.
Objective 1: To operate transit services that are reliable, offer competitive travel times, and adhere to published timetables or service intervals

Indicator: Percentage of trips on time at departure, arrivals and enroute timing points

Guidelines:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Regional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92 - 95% within 5 minutes; none early</td>
<td>92 - 95% not more than 5 minutes; none early</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90 - 92% within 5 minutes; none early</td>
<td>90 - 92% not more than 5 minutes; none early</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80 - 85% within 5 minutes; none early</td>
<td>80 - 85% not more than 5 minutes; none early</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80 - 85% within 5 minutes; none early</td>
<td>80 - 85% not more than 5 minutes; none early</td>
<td>80 - 85% within 5 minutes; none early</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicator: Percentage of completed trips

Guidelines:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>ADA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97.5 - 100.0% completed</td>
<td>97.5 - 100.0% completed</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>97.5 - 100.0% completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97.5 - 100.0% completed</td>
<td>97.5 - 100.0% completed</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>97.5 - 100.0% completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97.5 - 100.0% completed</td>
<td>97.5 - 100.0% completed</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>97.5 - 100.0% completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97.5 - 100.0% completed</td>
<td>97.5 - 100.0% completed</td>
<td>100% Completed</td>
<td>97.5 - 100.0% completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicator: Percentage of ADA trips with pickup within schedule window

Guideline: 94 - 96 percent of pickups within schedule window

Objective 2: To maintain or improve existing average speeds on existing transit services within the geographical zones

Indicator: Average transit operating speed in each zone

Guideline: To maintain or improve the average fleet speed for the transit services in each geographic zone
The reliability objective provides a link between the published timetables (promised service) and actual service operated on the road. Service reliability is a critical factor that influences people’s modal choice. The Automatic Vehicle Location (AVL) system now being installed on the transit fleet will provide useful data for evaluating the schedule reliability of the system. These guidelines are consistent with the capabilities of the electronic data reporting that will be feasible with AVL.

The current standard allows buses to operate up to one minute ahead of schedule. The proposed regional guidelines eliminate this leeway. The target guideline for local and community bus service has been lowered to 80 percent from the current standard of 95 percent. This was done to reflect experience from other transit agencies that have shown that the previous manual schedule adherence checking often overstates reliability, and to distinguish local and community buses from regional and corridor cars where greater reliability is expected due to use of reserved rights of way and priority systems. In future years, the targets can be adjusted as more data is received and analyzed.

The guidelines for ADA Paratransit are compatible with federal law that establishes guidelines for ADA Paratransit service. MTS considers an ACCESS trip to be on time if the passenger is picked up within a ten-minute window surrounding the promised pickup time. In FY 2007, MTS was able to achieve 95 percent on time performance based on this standard, which offers a very high level of service compared to most large urban areas in the country. MTS has advised that due to growing traffic congestion, and longer trip lengths, it may be necessary to either lengthen the ten-minute window, or reduce the percentage guideline for on time performance. The federal law does not specify performance levels for missed trips or schedule performance but does require a high level of service be provided. The guidelines provided here maintain this expectation of a high quality service.

The second objective is to ensure that transit services do not lose speed over the course of the evaluation period. Slower services cost more in operating expenses and are less attractive to passengers. It does become increasingly difficult to maintain service speed in face of growing traffic congestion; however, implementation of transit priority measures can mitigate this problem.

**Environmental Justice Objective**

This objective supports the Federal Environmental Justice and Title VI legislation and is provided in Goal 8.

**Objective:** To ensure that transit service and amenities provided in minority and low-income census tracts is on average comparable to the level of service and amenity provided in majority census tracts in the same geographic zone

**Indicator:** Percentage of minority and low-income census tracts with transit service that is on average comparable to the average level of service and amenities provided in majority census tracts of the same service zone

**Guideline:** 100 percent of minority and low-income census tracts with transit service that is on average comparable to the average level of service and amenities provided in majority census tracts of the same service zone
Title VI and Environmental Justice are federal regulations that require federally funded transit operators to provide service in minority and low-income census tracts that is not of a lower quality than service typically provided in majority census tracts. SANDAG must file a report to the FTA every three years to confirm that the federal regulations are being met. The most recent Triennial Title VI report (2006) is available on the SANDAG Web site, www.sandag.org.

Integration with TDA Performance Monitoring

The SANDAG Transportation Committee approved a Quarterly Monitoring program to track the performance indicators specified in the Transportation Development Act (TDA) of California. The TDA requires that SANDAG, as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA), monitor the performance of each transit agency in San Diego County and determine if the agency has made a reasonable effort to improve performance. The SANDAG Quarterly Monitoring program will track the performance of the transit agencies as measured by six specific operational and cost indicators. These indicators are:

- Operating cost per passenger (adjusted for annual inflation)
- Operating cost per revenue hour (adjusted for annual inflation)
- Passengers per revenue hour
- Passengers per revenue mile
- Revenue hours per employee
- Farebox recovery ratio

The operating cost performance indicators are adjusted for inflation using the Consumer Price Index (CPI) transportation data series specific to the San Diego region. For this monitoring program, bi-annual unadjusted inflation data is utilized in order to scale operating costs to the most current fiscal year. The transportation specific inflation data include costs relating to the purchasing of new vehicles, gasoline prices, tire prices, and taxes that are directly associated with the costs of providing transportation. In addition, the TDA requires that each transit service operate with a specific farebox cost recovery. The rate varies from 18.8 percent for NCTD bus services (Breeze, FAST, ADA Paratransit) to 20 percent for MTS commuter bus services and 31.9 percent for MTS bus including DART and rural services.

The TDA Performance Monitoring Program provides a picture of how well the local transit operators are being managed by examining their costs and effectiveness. The Regional Goals and Objectives outlined in Section 4 provide a policy framework through a set of forward objectives, guidelines, and criteria on which can be measured. The TDA indicators will provide a look at how well the transit system has been managed in the recent past (12 quarters), while the goals and objectives provide an outlook for where the system is destined.
Current Performance Monitoring Program

In order for transit agencies to continue to receive TDA funding, SANDAG must determine that each operating agency has made a reasonable effort to improve performance, as measured by the five indicators listed above. In the past, this was generally accomplished by an annual goal setting and evaluation process. However, since the goals were often set based on the previous year’s actual performance, the goals and performance tended to chase each other from year to year. In addition, at the time the goals were evaluated only six months of actual data were available. This meant that the determination whether or not a goal was met was based on six months of actual performance data and six months of forecast data.

Each year SANDAG also is required to work with the transit agencies to develop actions to improve productivity. The actions may be an outgrowth of the transit agency’s internal evaluation and monitoring process, SANDAG’s quarterly performance monitoring, the Regional Short-Range Transit Planning Task Force activities, or the TDA Triennial audit process. The process currently lacks a vision for the transit system that can be applied in the short-range timeframe of one to five years.

Proposed Performance Monitoring and Objectives Program

In previous years the transit agencies have made reasonable efforts to achieve the productivity goals that were established through the TDA process. However, changes to the Performance Monitoring Program are needed to make it a more useful tool to measure and improve the regional transit system.

Performance improvement is best measured over a multi-year timeframe that focuses on longer term trends. The current program’s emphasis on annual targets is too short a period to draw definitive conclusions about performance, recognizing that steps taken by the transit agencies to improve system performance often take a several years to be fully realized. Annual targets also are subject to unforeseen circumstances that may cause short-term impacts on costs and ridership (e.g., fuel price fluctuations, troop deployment from bases) that distort how well the system is actually performing.

The revised performance monitoring program alters the current program by:
- Setting five-year performance goals, tied to the goals and objectives outlined in this Coordinated Plan
- Quarterly and annual tracking of the six performance indicators specified by the TDA
- Evaluating annual performance in terms of the progress made towards achieving the multi-year goals and direction of the trends in the six required TDA performance indicators

Table 4.3 summarizes the indicators that will be tracked and reported as part of the TDA and SANDAG performance evaluation process. It is anticipated that several of the annual indicators will shift to quarterly as the APC program is expanded to more and more buses within the regional fleet.

In summary, the TDA quarterly monitoring process provides a retrospective view on how the systems have been managed over the previous twelve quarters, and the system policy objectives provide a means of defining where the system is heading in the next five years.
Table 4.3 Combined TDA and SANDAG Performance Evaluation Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>MTS &amp; NCTD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farebox Recovery Level*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating cost per passenger*</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating cost per vehicle*</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers per vehicle service hour*</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers per vehicle service mile*</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle service hours per employee*</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity/Utilization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking Distance/Access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Span/Convenience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability/Schedules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Speed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*indicators required to be tracked in TDA Quarterly Report

The six indicators established by TDA will be calculated quarterly by SANDAG using data provided by the transit agencies. The trend data will be maintained for at least a three year period (12 quarters). Targets will not be established; however, the data can be used to evaluate whether the transit agencies are improving their performance in light of external circumstances (e.g., fuel prices). If trend data suggests that performance is weakening or declining, SANDAG and the transit agencies will work together to understand the factors behind the decline and develop strategies for reversing the trend. The data will be examined to determine if short-term aberrations in costs or ridership are causing the performance problems.

The data used to calculate performance based on the TDA measures above will continue to be based on actual operating results and passenger counts produced from farebox data. The indicators will be measured separately for MTS and NCTD. The MTS data will be segregated in four categories: Regular Bus, DART, Paratransit Bus, and Trolley. The NCTD data will be segregated into four categories: Breeze, FAST, Coaster, ADA, and Paratransit. In the future, SPRINTER data also will be shown separately. While MTS partially funds the Coronado Ferry service for commuter trips between Downtown San Diego and the City of Coronado, this service is not evaluated under the TDA performance measures and is not included in any of the MTS service categories.

To facilitate a greater understanding of each individual evaluated service (MTS Bus, MTS DART, MTS Paratransit, MTS Trolley, NCTD Breeze, NCTD Coaster, NCTD FAST, and NCTD Paratransit), an unweighted composite index of the six TDA performance measures also will be used to determine overall trends.
4.3.4 Human Service Transportation Objectives

The objectives outlined below are designed to provide the quantifiable outcomes for each of the goals related to human service transportation as discussed in the goals section of this chapter. The federal government has identified five measures for evaluating the performance of transportation services funded as through the human service provisions of SAFETEA-LU. These federal indicators have been restructured into the objective-indicator-guideline format to be consistent with the format for the transit objectives. In future years, it is anticipated that additional objectives will be developed as SANDAG becomes more involved in planning and funding human service transportation. The human service transportation objectives support the lifeline transit, productivity, nondiscriminatory, and mobility goals (3, 5, 9, and 10) listed in section 4.3.1.

New Freedom Objectives

The NF program is a federal program intended to improve mobility choices for persons with disabilities. The FTA has mandated specific performance measures, but they have not set guidelines or targets. Since this is the first year SANDAG has been involved in these types of programs there is no baseline information to develop guidelines and targets for expected levels of performance. The guidelines or targets will be added in future Coordinated Plans.

**Objective 1:** To improve geographic coverage, service quality, or service times for transportation services for persons with disabilities in the current year

**Indicator 1:** Improved geographic area in square miles where services are being provided under NF

**Indicator 2:** Improved service quality for disabled transportation

**Indicator 3:** Improved service times for disabled transportation
**Objective 2:** To add or improve environmental infrastructure, technology and vehicles that impact the availability of transportation services for the disabled in the current year

**Indicator 1:** Improved infrastructure and technologies

**Indicator 2:** Improved vehicles

**Objective 2:** To attract riders to NF services (as measures by one-way trips)

**Indicator 1:** Improved number of one-way trips on NF services

---

**JARC Program Objectives**

Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) is a federal program intended to improve mobility choices for employment related travel for persons of limited means. The FTA has mandated specific performance measures, but they have not set guidelines or targets. Since this is the first year SANDAG has been involved in these types of programs, there is no baseline information to develop guidelines and targets for expected levels of performance. The guidelines or targets will be added in future Coordinated Plans.

**Objective 1:** To increase the estimated number of jobs that can be accessed as a result of geographic or temporal coverage of JARC projects implemented in current year

**Indicator 1:** Number of jobs within a quarter mile of a stop on a JARC funded services

**Objective 2:** To attract riders to new JARC services (as measured by one-way trips)

**Indicator 1:** Number of one-way trips on JARC funded service

---

**Coordination Objective**

The major initiative of SANDAG to improve transportation coordination among health and human service transportation providers has been the creation and funding of the CTSA. In 2006, SANDAG designated Full Access & Coordinated Transportation (FACT) of Oceanside to be the CTSA for San Diego County.

The role of the CTSA is to improve transportation service required by social service recipients by promoting consolidation of social service transportation incorporating such benefits as centralized dispatching, combined purchasing of necessary equipment and supplies, centralized maintenance, centralized administration to eliminate duplicative administrative tasks, and consolidation of existing sources of funding. This consolidation results in more efficient and effective use of vehicles throughout the region.
The core mission of the CTSA is to consolidate and coordinate transportation services to people with disabilities, senior citizens, social service agencies, health care providers, various organizations, and individuals within that particular service area.

Since this is the first year SANDAG has actively been involved in promoting coordination of programs there is no baseline information to develop guidelines and targets for expected levels of performance. The guidelines or targets will be added in future Coordinated Plans. However, the following objective has been set by SANDAG to develop and encourage coordinated transportation.

**Objective 1:** To effectively advance coordinated access to the full spectrum of community transportation options for population in need (seniors, persons with disabilities, and persons of limited means) through mechanisms such as mobility management, vehicle brokerage, coordinated service, etc.

**Indicator:** Increase the number of human service programs including coordinated transportation as an integrated component
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5 Socio-Economic Analysis

Demographic information was examined for the Coordinated Plan to develop a better understanding of how these characteristics shape regional travel patterns and transportation needs. Chapter 8 of this document provides strategies to address any unmet needs regarding the travel patterns identified in this socio-economic analysis. The information used to conduct this evaluation included a detailed assessment of demographic information regarding population, car ownership, housing, and employment trends. In addition, detailed information about persons with limited incomes, individuals with disabilities, and older adults was gathered to help assess the transportation needs of these groups since they have a greater likelihood of being dependent on either the public transportation system or social service transportation networks to meet their daily transportation needs.

5.1 Regional Population

In the San Diego region, population densities vary throughout the county with the highest densities concentrated in the older, central neighborhoods and in some of the downtown areas of the region’s larger cities. Downtown San Diego, Mid-City San Diego, National City, western Chula Vista, San Ysidro, Downtown El Cajon, Mira Mesa, the La Jolla University area, Escondido, San Ysidro and the beach communities generally have the highest population densities (see Figure 5.1). However, recent planning and development projects have yielded increased population growth in many of the suburban and rural communities in the region, especially eastern Chula Vista, Carlsbad, San Marcos, along the Interstate 15 (I-15) corridor, and in neighboring Riverside County. SANDAG’s Smart Growth initiative is encouraging the development of new, higher density development along existing and future transit corridors.

The San Diego region surpassed the 3 million mark in 2003 in the midst of a 9 percent cumulative growth spurt occurring between 2000 and 2006. However, recent growth has slowed due to the imbalance between wages and home prices. This has, in turn, led to increased development in neighboring regions. The majority of this growth has occurred in southwest Riverside County. However, East County, South County, Imperial County, and south of the border in Mexico have grown as well. San Diego also experienced significant out-migration in recent years, yielding an average annual total growth (foreign immigration and natural population growth minus out-migration) of only 0.89 percent over the last two years (2004 to 2006).

5.2 Regional Housing

While population increased by 9 percent over the last six years (2000 to 2006), the development of new housing units in the region rose only modestly by 7.5 percent, yielding a significant need for housing in the region. However, median home values, fueled by a diversifying economy and low interest rates, rose over 100 percent during the same period. This rapid increase in home values significantly outpaced increased wages, thereby creating a shortage of affordable housing in the region. The resulting affordable housing and jobs imbalance resulted in significant out-migration to Riverside County, where approximately 32,000 residents of Riverside County now commute daily to San Diego jobs.
Figure 5.1: Regional Population Density (Place of Residence)
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This phenomenon contributed to the growth of Riverside County which reached the 2 million population mark in early 2007 and continues to grow due to the availability of relatively inexpensive land and the development of several new communities along the I-15 corridor. The managed lane program, by reducing congestion and introducing Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) on the I-15 corridor, will likely encourage this growth pattern.

5.3 Regional Employment

From 2000 to 2006, the labor force in San Diego increased by 9 percent which roughly matched the residential population increase during the same period. Most of the region’s jobs are located within the urban areas of the region, especially in Downtown San Diego, Kearny Mesa, and Sorrento Valley/University Town Center as shown in Figure 5.2. In order to determine which areas have the greatest volumes of commuting activity, a comparison of residential and daytime population was prepared. SANDAG develops estimates of the daytime population for various areas in the region. The daytime population of an area includes employees, students, shoppers and leisure visitors or tourists. These daytime populations can be compared with the known residential population of an area to estimate the volume of daytime commuters. Table 5.1 shows the net increase or decrease expected from the influx of daytime commuters into a specific area. The top ten areas with population increases during the daytime represent areas with a larger amount of commuters than residences while the bottom ten represent areas that are primarily residential.

Table 5.1: San Diego Daytime Population Change (2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Areas With Increasing Daytime Population (Top 10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Central San Diego</td>
<td>162,430</td>
<td>264,982</td>
<td>102,552</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kearny Mesa</td>
<td>150,322</td>
<td>229,866</td>
<td>79,544</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>55,526</td>
<td>98,537</td>
<td>43,011</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Del Mar-Mira Mesa</td>
<td>150,431</td>
<td>172,898</td>
<td>22,467</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>79,376</td>
<td>98,066</td>
<td>18,690</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Peninsula</td>
<td>61,890</td>
<td>77,499</td>
<td>15,609</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Coronado</td>
<td>26,591</td>
<td>41,632</td>
<td>15,041</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>El Cajon</td>
<td>122,695</td>
<td>130,415</td>
<td>7,720</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Alpine</td>
<td>14,925</td>
<td>19,277</td>
<td>4,352</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>La Mesa</td>
<td>58,033</td>
<td>62,155</td>
<td>4,122</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Areas With Decreasing Daytime Population (Top 10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S.E. San Diego</td>
<td>159,852</td>
<td>110,153</td>
<td>-49,699</td>
<td>-31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mid City</td>
<td>170,610</td>
<td>151,054</td>
<td>-19,556</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>South Bay</td>
<td>136,685</td>
<td>120,368</td>
<td>-16,317</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Oceanside</td>
<td>163,180</td>
<td>147,925</td>
<td>-15,255</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Spring Valley</td>
<td>81,514</td>
<td>67,014</td>
<td>-14,500</td>
<td>-18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Elliot-Navajo</td>
<td>89,788</td>
<td>75,411</td>
<td>-14,377</td>
<td>-16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>100,382</td>
<td>87,931</td>
<td>-12,451</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Fallbrook</td>
<td>47,403</td>
<td>38,109</td>
<td>-9,294</td>
<td>-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lakeside</td>
<td>55,859</td>
<td>46,906</td>
<td>-8,953</td>
<td>-16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sweetwater</td>
<td>104,548</td>
<td>95,914</td>
<td>-8,634</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SANDAG 2030 Regional Growth Forecast Update, Base Year Data
Figure 5.2: Regional Population Density (Place of Work)
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The three areas which experience the largest net increase in daytime population are Central San Diego, Kearny Mesa, the University of California San Diego (UCSD) university area and Del Mar - Mira Mesa. These four areas represent more than one third (36 percent) of the region’s jobs. In addition, Coronado, with a daytime population increase of 57 percent, gains over 15,000 persons and represents a significant percentage increase in daytime population.

5.4 Regional Mobility

The improving economy over the last seven years coupled with the identified lack of affordable housing have yielded increasingly long commute patterns in the San Diego region. As a result, people travel between counties the way they previously traveled between neighborhoods within cities. With people traveling further to reach jobs than ever before, many of them are spending significantly more time on the roads or at border crossings. However, the data shows that people in the San Diego region are also expanding their mobility options and choosing to take transit more frequently. Table 5.2 shows that the growth in transit ridership in the region has increased at a faster rate than either population, employment, or vehicle registrations from 2005 to 2006.

Table 5.2: Population, Vehicle Registration, and Transit Ridership (2005-2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>Difference (+ increase/- decrease)</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>3,039,277</td>
<td>3,066,820</td>
<td>+27,543</td>
<td>+0.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>1,292,800</td>
<td>1,310,900</td>
<td>+18,100</td>
<td>+1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Registration</td>
<td>2,403,532</td>
<td>2,443,893</td>
<td>+40,361</td>
<td>+1.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Ridership</td>
<td>88,649,223</td>
<td>94,501,821</td>
<td>+5,852,598</td>
<td>+6.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: SANDAG, Department of Motor Vehicles, MTS, and NCTD.

In spite of recent growth in transit ridership, the overall modal share of transit in the region remains low. It is estimated that 1.9 percent of peak trips and 1.4 percent of all day trips in the region are now taken on transit. The continued migration of jobs and housing to the fringe areas of the region (including areas outside the county) point to the need for new regional transit services and new approaches to getting people to and from these areas. The low-density nature of development in these outlying areas (excluding Mexico), however, presents challenges to provide adequate transit access and to deliver cost-effective transit solutions. In the urban regions of the county, the SANDAG Smart Growth initiative is dependent on fast, frequent, and reliable transit that can support spontaneous travel.
5.5 Demographic Analysis - Persons with Limited Means

The assessment of the residential, employment and mobility characteristics for persons with limited incomes is important since these individuals are often dependent on public transit to meet their trip making needs. An assessment of those individuals in poverty was undertaken and based on the poverty rates defined in the Federal Jobs Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) (Section 5316) program which expands the assessment of poverty to include all individuals whose income level is less than 150 percent of the poverty line. Table 5.3 illustrates the San Diego County population by poverty level from the Census 2000 to show the number of persons in poverty at the traditional 100 percent threshold in addition to the 150 percent poverty threshold. Census 2000 data was used since it is the most current data available for this population subgroup. Nearly 22 percent of the regional population earns less than 150 percent of the federal poverty level.

### Table 5.3: San Diego County Population Percentage by Poverty Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>&lt;100% Poverty Level</th>
<th>&lt;150% Poverty Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persons</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>338,399</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census 2000, Summary File 3 (SF3), Sample Data, Table P88 (Ratio of Income in 1999 to Poverty Level)

Based on the data contained in Table 5.3, the expansion of the poverty to the 150 percent threshold potentially doubles the number of persons eligible to benefit from the JARC programs and illustrates the number of individuals included in the poverty definition under the Federal guidelines. The almost 600,000 individuals in poverty were mapped by Census Block Group to determine place of residence. The corresponding map of population densities for individuals in poverty at or below the 150 percent threshold are shown in Figure 5.3. Concentrations of individuals with limited incomes are highest in the denser urban areas of San Ysidro, City Heights, Southeast San Diego, National City, western Chula Vista, El Cajon, parts of Escondido, Vista and Oceanside, and the communities around downtown San Diego.

High poverty rates are also generally associated with low rates of car ownership and higher rates of transit usage. A map of households with zero car ownership is also included as Figure 5.4. The correlation of individuals in poverty and areas with zero car ownership rates point to the need for good, high-frequency local transit services connecting the centralized urban communities with major job centers.
Figure 5.3: Regional Population Below Poverty (Place of Residence)

Source: Census 2000, Block Group Data
Figure 5.4: Zero Car Households

Source: Census 2000, Block Group Data
5.6 Mobility Assessment – Persons With Limited Means

The Census Transportation Planning Package (CTPP) data was used to conduct a mobility assessment of persons in poverty since it provides specific information on population subgroups such as persons in poverty and individuals with disabilities. The data was examined by Census Block Group to determine both residential and job locations. This data source and corresponding evaluation is particularly important to determine the commute trip transportation needs for individuals with limited incomes. This information can then be used to determine where funds from the federal JARC program should be spent to improve transportation for workers with limited means.1

Based on the CTPP data from 2000, there are about 170,000 persons below the 150 percent poverty threshold who work and presumably need to travel to their place of employment. This represents approximately 30 percent of the total persons below the 150 percent poverty threshold countywide with the densities of these residential locations shown in Figure 5.5. The overall poverty map and specific worker poverty map show similar concentrations of individuals with limited incomes. As is the case with the general population, poverty is higher in the denser urban areas of San Ysidro, City Heights, National City, western Chula Vista, El Cajon, parts of Escondido, Vista, Oceanside, and the communities around downtown San Diego. However, there are a few notable exceptions where workers in poverty are much more heavily concentrated than areas with non-working poor individuals. The areas with high worker poverty not identified in the overall poverty map are Linda Vista, the UCSD area, Pacific Beach, Ocean Beach, Mission Beach, and Imperial Beach.

The place of work trip destination represents the other half of the information required to determine the travel needs of individuals with limited incomes for their journey-to-work trip. The map of jobs densities for individuals in poverty is included as Figure 5.6. The heaviest concentrations of jobs for poor individuals are located in downtown San Diego, Mission Valley, the UCSD University area, the SDSU College Area, La Mesa, La Jolla, the Blue Line trolley corridor in National City and parts of Chula Vista, the 4th/5th/6th Avenue corridors extending from downtown San Diego to Hillcrest, Kearney Mesa, Pacific Beach, Central Escondido, San Marcos, and Oceanside.

---

1 The Federal Transit Administration specifies that “funds from the JARC program are available for capital, planning and operating expenses that support the development and maintenance of transportation services designed to transport low-income individuals to and from jobs and activities related to their employment and to support reverse commute projects (FTA C 9050.1).
Figure 5.5: Regional Working Population Below Poverty (Place of Residence)

Source: Census 2000, Block Group Data
Figure 5.6: Regional Working Population Below Poverty (Place of Work)
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5.7 Demographic Analysis - Individuals With Disabilities

There are almost 800,000 persons with disabilities in San Diego County according to the most recent 2000 Census estimates. There is a close correlation between the residential location of persons with disabilities and persons of limited means. The likely reason for this is that many people with disabilities also have lower incomes. Fortunately many of these housing areas also have good local transit service and access to complementary ADA service. Based on this assessment the areas with the highest concentrations of individuals with disabilities are the Mid-City communities of San Diego and City Heights, as well as parts Vista, Escondido, El Cajon, Linda Vista, and along the trolley corridor in National City and Chula Vista. Figure 5.7 illustrates the overall population density for individuals with disabilities in San Diego County.

5.8 Mobility Assessment - Individuals With Disabilities

A mobility assessment was also prepared for individuals with disabilities based on CTPP data. The Federal New Freedom program makes funding available for the transportation needs of persons with disabilities, regardless of trip purpose. The assessment of the work trip for persons with disabilities provides an additional layer of data to assess the transportation needs of the disabled community. Figure 5.8 illustrates the place of residence for about 180,000 workers in San Diego County who have disabilities. Based on this assessment, the areas with the highest concentrations of workers with disabilities includes the areas identified in the overall disabled map in addition to the areas of Mira Mesa, Pacific Beach, Imperial Beach, Fallbrook, and Northeast Oceanside.

The place of employment data was also available and revealed the workplace destination for these individuals. The largest workplace concentrations for individuals with disabilities generally mirror the job locations of the general population with most of the region’s jobs located within the urban areas of the region such as Downtown San Diego, Kearny Mesa, Mission Valley, Downtown Escondido, and Oceanside (see Figure 5.9).
Figure 5.7: Regional Population Density of People with Disabilities (Place of Residence)
Figure 5.8: Regional Population Density of Disabled Workers (Place of Residence)

Source: Census 2000, Block Group Data
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Figure 5.9: Regional Population Density of Disabled Workers (Place of Work)
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5.9 Demographic Analysis - Older Adults

The aging population in San Diego County is projected to significantly increase in the near future as the baby boomer generation ages. It is projected that by Year 2030 there will be a 131 percent increase in persons ages 65 to 84, while persons age 85+ will experience an even larger jump of 175 percent. Figures 5.10 and 5.11 illustrate population densities of both of these age groups (65+ and 85+) based on Census 2000 data. Census 2000 data was used since it is the most recent population data available for this subgroup. Based on an evaluation of these figures, senior concentrations in the 65+ age category are currently highest in western Chula Vista, National City, Hillcrest, City Heights, Coronado, La Mesa, El Cajon, Linda Vista, Point Loma, La Jolla, Mira Mesa, Rancho Bernardo, Escondido, and Oceanside. For those age 85+, population densities are currently highest in El Cajon, Hillcrest, La Jolla, Rancho Bernardo, Escondido, Vista, and Oceanside.

5.10 Mobility Assessment - Older Adults

Most seniors do not need to travel to work as part of their daily routine; however, seniors do have a need for basic mobility including access to services both within and beyond their communities. Due to the expected increase in the older adult population over the next several years, there will be an increased demand for transit and paratransit services for these individuals. Many of these individuals will rely on dependable public transportation and social service transportation to complete necessary errands, get to medical appointments and to take discretionary trips such as visiting friends and family.

Access to routine care and preventative medical services (otherwise known as non-emergency medical transportation) is one of the most important needs among seniors. Seniors are a transportation disadvantaged group and isolation can bring about significant social and medical problems. Recent research conducted by the Transit Cooperative Research Program (TCRP)\(^2\) has concluded that approximately 3.6 million Americans miss or delay non-emergency medical care each year due to transportation difficulties and a disproportionate number of these individuals are seniors. However, the TCRP found that transportation is relatively inexpensive compared with the high and rapidly growing cost of healthcare. More importantly, the study found that of the 12 common, but serious medical conditions analyzed, providing preventable care was cost effective for all 12 conditions. In four of the conditions (Heart Disease, Diabetes, Prenatal Care, and Asthma) actual cost savings (medical care plus transportation) were achieved by improving transportation access to medical care. This means that additional investment in transportation for non-emergency medical care leads to a net decrease in total costs to the taxpayer when both transportation and healthcare costs are included.

It also is expected that more and more seniors will decide to continue to live in their single family suburban residence for as long as possible. This trend will create a strain on current Paratransit and human service transportation operations. With limited public transit and human services transportation infrastructure to serve these individuals, senior isolation and withdrawal may occur after they lose their ability to drive. The related consequences of a loss in mobility for seniors are a loss in independence, a dependence on others, decrease in life satisfaction, increased depression, and (as noted above) increased medical costs. Compounding the need for public transit and human service transportation for older adults will be the anticipated growth in these population groups as the baby boomers age and move into retirement.

Figure 5.10: Regional Population Density of Persons Age 65+
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Figure 5.11: Regional Population Density of Persons Age 85+
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CHAPTER 6

TRANSPORTATION INVENTORY
6 Transportation Inventory

The following chapter provides an inventory of the public transportation services available in the San Diego region. A comprehensive list of social service transportation providers primarily serving disabled, elderly, and/or low-income populations is included in this chapter. This inventory is further organized with regard to the public or private status of the identified service. In addition, to recognize the vital connection served by San Diego County in promoting interregional transportation, services to and from the surrounding areas in Riverside County, Orange County, Imperial County, and Mexico also have been included in this inventory.

6.1 Public Transportation Providers

Public transit service in the San Diego region is provided by two agencies, the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and the North County Transit District (NCTD). These two agencies provide services through a variety of directly operated and contracted services, including three fixed-route bus operators, San Diego Trolley Incorporated, NCTD COASTER commuter train service, Coronado Ferry service, general demand responsive operators and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) paratransit operators. These operators provide service in SANDAG’s area of jurisdiction covering 4,261 square miles and encompassing 18 incorporated cities and the County of San Diego. A more detailed description of the services provided by MTS and NCTD, along with route statistical information, is included in Appendices B and C.

School Buses

The provision of school transportation, with dedicated yellow school buses, is a discretionary service of local school districts. Of the 42 school districts in San Diego County, 30 offer yellow bus transportation to all of their students while six offer transportation to their special needs students only. On a daily basis, approximately 54,000 students and 11,700 special needs students are transported to and from school by yellow school buses. In school districts where yellow school busing is not provided, the public transit system is often the only alternative for middle and high school students. In some areas of the County, students are a major source of ridership and revenue for transit operators, but they are also a challenge to serve due to the sharp peak periods created by strict school schedules. In addition, new schools in some parts of the region are being built in areas beyond existing transit services. Due to the limitations of transit operational funding, creating service extensions to meet the needs of the new schools are not always feasible.

The largest single school district in San Diego County is the San Diego Unified School District which operates about 507 buses. In comparison, the combined transit fleets of San Diego Transit, MTS Contract Services, National City Transit, Chula Vista Transit, and North County Transit District operate approximately 578 peak buses. The transit systems have substantially higher ridership because transit buses are in use for many more hours each day than school buses. Comparing the fleet size provides an excellent indication of the substantial demand for school transportation during peak periods. Altogether, the remaining 41 school districts in both the urban and suburban portions of the County operate about 574 buses.
The San Diego Unified School District, or San Diego City Schools (SDCS), transports about 23,000 students out of a total enrollment of 135,000. The majority of those students (about 71 percent) are either in the voluntary integration or magnet schools programs. The majority of the remaining students are special education students who are offered transportation as part of their Individual Education Plan (IEP). SDCS is legally obligated to provide transportation to special education students to match student needs with the program that best meets their needs.

Transportation is provided for eligible students who attend an integration program outside of their neighborhood school boundaries. No student living less than a mile from school is eligible to ride. For Magnet schools, only elementary students who live two miles or more from the school, and atypical, middle, and secondary school students who live 2.5 miles or more from the school, are eligible for transportation. Secondary and atypical school students may be expected to travel up to one mile from their homes or service addresses to the designated bus stop. Elementary students (including kindergartners) may be expected to travel up to four-tenths (0.4) of a mile to the bus stop.

Figure 6.1 summarizes the SDCS system ridership by program while Figure 6.2 shows the percentage of the transportation budget allocated to each program. Special education provides a larger share of the transportation budget than the number of students carried by the program would suggest. This is due to the fact that special education students are offered more door-to-door transportation, and often take a considerably longer amount of time to load and unload in the bus. The transportation budget is allocated by the time required rather than by child, to account for the differences in the two types of service offered.
**Figure 6.1:** SDSC system ridership by program

**Ridership by Program**

- Special Needs: 20%
- Integration (Voluntary Ethnic Enrollment Program and Magnet Schools): 71%
- Other*: 4%
- Over Capacity: 5%

* "Other" includes No Child Left Behind, homeless student transportation and others.

**Figure 6.2:** Percentage of the transportation budget allocated to each program

**Budget by Program**

- Special Needs: 46%
- Integration (Voluntary Ethnic Enrollment Program and Magnet Schools): 49%
- Over Capacity: 2%
- Other*: 3%

USCD Shuttles
UCSD Shuttles

University of California San Diego (UCSD) operates an extensive network of eleven shuttle routes around the UCSD campus and to major offsite landmarks such as the Old Town Trolley Station, the Sorrento Valley Coast Station, University Town Center, Hillcrest and the airport on major holidays. Access to the shuttles is limited to USCD students, faculty, and staff. The services operate various schedules, but some service is available seven days per week, and as late as 12:15 a.m. The service is free of charge for currently registered UCSD students, faculty, and staff.

The routes are:

- **Academic-year shuttles:**
  - Campus Loop Shuttle
  - City shuttle
  - East Campus/Regents Express Shuttles
  - Holiday Airport Shuttle

- **Year-round shuttles:**
  - COASTER Shuttle
  - Hillcrest/Campus Shuttle
  - Hillcrest/Old Town Transit Center Shuttle
  - Medical Center Connector Shuttle
  - Mesa Housing Shuttle
  - Scripps Institution of Oceanography Shuttle
  - Torrey Pines Center Shuttle

In addition, UCSD has established a special arrangement with both MTS and NCTD allowing students, faculty, and staff to ride free on regular MTS routes in the campus area. The Map in Figure 6.3 shows the MTS routes included within the prearranged free-zone area. UCSD passengers may board NCTD route 101 for free anywhere along the route between Oceanside and UTC.
Figure 6.3: MTS Free-Fare zone for UCSD students, faculty, and staff
Private Transportation Providers

The San Diego region also has a number of privately funded transportation services that cater to the public or large groups of select users. These services do not necessarily receive public funds but in some cases have emerged due to the inability of publicly financed systems to meet demands as a result of funding, cross boundary issues, or the limited size of the market.

Old Town Trolley

The Old Town Trolley is a tourist-oriented service that operates themed buses year-round. A two-hour round trip adult ticket costs $30. On and off privileges are allowed on each tour, providing visitors the opportunity to explore major landmarks. Major points served are Old Town, Balboa Park, Horton Plaza, Coronado Island, Seaport Village, and the San Diego Zoo. There are currently no joint fares or reciprocity arrangements between the Old Town Trolley and the public transit system.

Friendship Transportation

Friendship Transportation formerly operated regularly scheduled commuter services between Temecula and Downtown San Diego, Kearny Mesa, and Mission Valley. They operated up to eight daily departures from Temecula to Downtown San Diego. The services are still advertised on their Web site but operations appear to have been suspended. The Web site suggests that additional services were planned for other employment areas such as Sorrento Valley, Torrey Pines, Mission Gorge, La Jolla/University Town Center, and Rancho Bernardo. Roundtrip fares were offered at $20, ten ride tickets were $85, and monthly passes started at $215. There were no joint fares or reciprocity arrangements between Friendship Transportation and the public transit system in San Diego or Riverside.

The service may have been eligible for financial support through the state-managed, federal program for inter-city bus transportation. The grants available might have been able to fund part of any operating deficit or the capital cost of the buses for the service.

Greyhound

Greyhound is a nationwide inter-city bus operator. Within San Diego County, Greyhound offers services from Oceanside, Escondido, El Cajon, and San Ysidro to Downtown San Diego. Greyhound services operate express via the Freeway system. In the suburbs, Greyhound operates from public transit centers in Oceanside, Escondido, El Cajon, and San Ysidro. However, in Downtown San Diego, Greyhound uses its own terminal. Greyhound operates seven days per week. Service on board the Oceanside and San Ysidro bus lines is typically offered every hour, throughout the day, with some early morning and/or late night trips.

Oceanside to San Diego service is offered 12 times daily, with an adult cash fare of $8 and a typical scheduled travel time of 50 minutes. Escondido to San Diego is offered four times daily, with an adult cash fare of $12.50 and a travel time of 40 minutes. El Cajon to San Diego is offered three times daily, with an adult cash fare of $10 and a travel time of 30 minutes. San Ysidro to San Diego
is offered 17 times daily, with an adult cash fare of $10 and a travel time of 25 minutes. NCTD and Greyhound have a joint ticketing scheme that allows Greyhound passengers to ride on NCTD between Escondido and Oceanside.

Casino Shuttles

Indian casinos in the rural areas of San Diego County have become major attractions for residents and visitors, creating a significant demand for bus services. Some casinos, such as Pala, Harrah's, and Viejas, are located on existing rural bus routes, while others are not. The casino industry has responded with special bus services for casino visitors and employees. Barona Valley Ranch Resort and Casino, Sycuan Resort and Casino, Valley View Casino, and Viejas Casino now operate shuttle service to selected areas throughout the county to help fill in the missing links in MTS and NCTD service networks.

Barona Valley Ranch Resort and Casino currently operates approximately 60 express shuttles to and from the East County, South Bay, Mira Mesa, and Kearny Mesa. These shuttles run from 5:15 a.m. until 2:15 a.m. the following morning and operate on Saturday and Sunday only. Passengers must be eighteen years or older to ride the shuttle and the fare to board the shuttle is $10. If the passenger has a Club Barona Card, the fare is free. In addition, Barona operates 3 express shuttles on Wednesdays only that services the Los Angeles and Laguna Woods areas. The fare to board those shuttles is also $10.

Sycuan Resort and Casino currently operates approximately 28 daily shuttles to and from the Plaza Bonita Shopping Center and the El Cajon Trolley Station. In addition, 14 daily shuttles also run to and from Tecate and Horario Diario in Mexico. Sycuan also operates 11 supplementary evening and bingo routes that service the South Bay, Chula Vista, National City, Spring Valley, Mira Mesa, Kearny Mesa, North Park, and North County, and these routes also run daily. All passengers must be 18 years or older to ride, and the fare to board is $10. If the passenger has a Club Sycuan Card, the fare is free.

Valley View Casino currently operates 12 shuttles that run daily to and from the North County Coast, Escondido, Rancho Bernardo, Poway, Rancho Peñasquitos, and Mira Mesa. Valley View also provides service on select days of the week to other areas in the county. On Tuesdays, Fridays, and Saturdays, 5 shuttles are offered from Chula Vista and National City, as well as from the Euclid and Market Trolley Station. Two shuttles service Downtown San Diego on Thursdays and Sundays only, and 2 shuttles service the Hillcrest area on Mondays and Wednesdays. Also, Valley View offers shuttle service to Laguna Woods Village on Mondays by reservation only. It is free to ride any of these shuttles.

Viejas Casino currently operates 44 daily shuttles that service El Cajon, Mira Mesa, Kearny Mesa, and Santee. These shuttles operate from 5:15 a.m. until 1:30 a.m. the following day. The fare to board is $10 and passengers must be 18 years or older to ride. If passengers have a V Club card, the fare is free.
While these casino shuttles do offer supplemental transit service to the existing MTS and NCTD routes, it should be noted that during the Unmet Transit Needs Hearings in 2005, the management of Harrah’s Casino in North County made a presentation on the unmet transit needs of their employees. The Casino noted that the current service provided by NCTD was inadequate and they asked for improved service to bring employees to their worksite at the casino.

**Employer Shuttles**

It is understood that employers in the region do offer shuttle services for their employees; however, there is no inventory of the services. The shuttles may be operated by company employees or contracted to a transportation provider. The shuttles typically operate from transit centers, such as the Sorrento Valley COASTER Station, or between remote employee parking and the jobsite. In future years, additional research will be undertaken to identify the locations of employer shuttles as their presence is indicative of gaps in transit coverage as well as a confirmation of potential demand.

**PAL**

The Palomar Limousine Company operates a shuttle service during the summer tourist season to transport passengers from rail stations at Poinsettia, Oceanside, and Downtown Carlsbad to Legoland. The service has a limited schedule, but fills a missing gap in the NCTD route network.

This service was in operation during the summer of 2006. A continuation of this program is still being discussed by PAL.

**Little Italy Shuttle**

The Little Italy Presto shuttle ran from late September 2005 through March of 2006 but is no longer in operation due to low ridership. Presto was designed to link the Little Italy neighborhood with tourists, Downtown workers and residents during the lunch period. Presto service was operated by two shuttle routes, with a fare of $0.25 per trip or $1 per day.

**Airport Shuttles**

Frequent shuttle service between Downtown San Diego, the Santa Fe Train Station, and Lindbergh Field is provided by MTS Route 992. In addition, private shuttle operators provide shared ride shuttle service from all points in San Diego County to the International Airport.

Cloud 9 Shuttle is a privately owned and operated shared ride taxi service that serves the airport market. Cloud 9 Shuttle is also authorized to provide “shared-ride” transportation throughout San Diego County to: San Diego Amtrak, the San Diego Convention Center, and the San Diego Cruise Terminal. All Cloud 9 Shuttle fares are structured by zip code.
**Mexicoach**

Mexicoach operates shuttle services from San Ysidro to their downtown terminal in Tijuana, with connections to Rosarito and the industrial parks. The service operates from the San Ysidro transit center and offers convenient connections with the Trolley. The cash fare on Mexicoach is $5 one way or $8 round trip. All buses are wheelchair lift equipped.

There are currently no joint fares or reciprocity arrangements between Mexicoach and the public transit system.

**California Paratransit Services**

California Paratransit Services provides transportation service for seniors and persons with disabilities. Transportation is contracted out through various taxi companies, who typically charge a fee of $2.30 per mile with no loading fee. Wheelchair accessible vehicles are available but scheduling is suggested one week in advance.

**Golden State Paratransit**

This agency provides direct transportation services to all San Diego County residents, 24 hours per day. The service charges a fee of $3.50 per mile and travels up to 250 miles. Vehicles are ADA accessible.

**Hospital Shuttles**

A number of agencies provide transportation to hospitals in the San Diego region. The hospitals may fulfill the demand themselves, providing shuttle services to their campuses and to their immediate neighbors. These include shuttles between remote parking areas and hospital sites for employees (e.g., Palomar Hospital District) and shuttles for staff and patients (e.g., UCSD Hillcrest and Veteran’s Hospital).

The private/public market has also facilitated this demand. The following is a limited list of medical-related transportation providers in the San Diego Region:

- American Medical Response
- Angel Flight
- Balboa Ambulance
- Care-A-Van
- Care Medical
- Critical Air Medicine
- East County Fire Department
- Laidlaw
- No Vacancy
- Pacific Ambulance
- Rainbow Medical Transport Services
- San Diego Medical Services
- Schaeffer Ambulance
- SoCal Medical
Hospital shuttles are not necessarily limited to private agencies, but in many cases fall into this category.

6.3 Social Service Transportation Providers

Several social service agencies provide transportation in San Diego County, effectively expanding the MTS and NCTD American with Disabilities Act (ADA) and paratransit services provided by those agencies. In July of 2006, SANDAG conducted an inventory of these services based on agencies listed with the United Way of San Diego County and the San Diego Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA). A total of 120 agencies were recorded, providing approximately 1,633,000 rides per year and serving approximately 1,062,000 transportation clients per year. The inventory can be viewed in its entirety, in Appendix D.

The public, private, non-profit, and “other” transportation providers that participated in the survey have been grouped and are analyzed below. The data has been refined from the original document in order to eliminate agencies, including, public transit, school districts, universities, and others, that have been previously included in this document.

Public Social Service Transportation Providers

Twenty eight public social service transportation providers were identified in the 2006 inventory. These groups provide approximately 19,382 rides per year with 57 total vehicles (6 cars, 45 vans, and 6 buses). Approximately 22 percent of these agencies provide transportation that is wheelchair accessible. According to the 2006 Inventory, public transportation providers provide the following services:

1. Direct transportation services (operate vehicles in-house) = 29 percent;
2. Transportation services using volunteers who use their own vehicles = 11 percent;
3. Direct services for clients at other agencies = 11 percent;
4. Transportation via contract (w/ another agency, vans, MRP, taxi voucher, shuttles, etc.) = 32 percent;
5. Only information and referral services regarding transportation options = 32 percent;
6. Provide both information and referral and direct transportation services = 7 percent.

Private Social Service Transportation Providers

Two private (for profit) social service transportation providers were identified in the 2006 inventory. While ridership data was not available from these organizations, total vehicles were stated at 21 (2 cars and 19 vans). Both agencies provide transportation that is wheelchair accessible.

According to the 2006 Inventory, one private, for-profit agency provides direct transportation services and the other provides wheelchair accessible rental vans. Since the provision of accessible rental vans was not a category itemized in the survey, this service fell under the “other” service category.
Non-Profit Social Service Transportation Providers

Eighty three non-profit social service transportation providers were identified in the 2006 inventory. These groups provide approximately 225,179 rides per year with 275 total vehicles (77 cars, 165 vans, and 33 buses). Approximately 31 percent of these agencies provide transportation that is wheelchair accessible. According to the 2006 Inventory, non-profit transportation providers provide the following services:

1. Direct transportation services (operate vehicles in-house) = 55 percent;
2. Transportation services using volunteers who use their own vehicles = 25 percent;
3. Direct services for clients at other agencies = 7 percent;
4. Transportation via contract (w/another agency, vans, MRP, taxi voucher, shuttles, etc.) = 17 percent;
5. Only information and referral services regarding transportation options = 19 percent;
6. Provide both information and referral and direct transportation services = 18 percent.

Four other non-profit transportation providers were identified through the Coordinated Planning process, which were not included in the 2006 inventory. These four services are explained below.

All Congregations Together (ACT)

All Congregations Together (ACT) is a non-profit organization whose Board of Directors consists of representatives from the faith, government, and business communities. ACT’s two main core services are transportation and community enhancement with transportation programs including community based shuttle transportation, medical transportation, senior transportation, employment related transportation, disabled transportation, and transportation related research. ACT’s ComLink Transportation Services includes the operation of 15 passenger vans providing door-to-door and point-to-point transportation to clients/customers/students of: St. Stephen’s Retirement Center, Holly Drive Leadership Academy, Jacobs Center for Neighborhood Innovation, Fourth District Senior Resource Center, MAAC Project Critical Hours Project, San Diego Birthing Project, San Diego Community College, CalWORKs, and many more.

Blue Star Senior Shuttle

Blue Star Senior Shuttle provides transportation to seniors and persons with disabilities, specifically, for day-out and medical transportation purposes. The agency operates with one 20 passenger wheelchair accessible van. The service area includes: Southeast County, Chula Vista, Lakeside, La Mesa, Spring Valley, and SDSU. Service fees range from $5 per ride (for a five mile radius) to $35 for roundtrip service to Torrey Pines.

Community Mobile

Community Mobile provides door-to-door transportation service to disadvantaged seniors as well as seniors with disabilities for such transportation needs as medical appointments, grocery shopping, religious services, and other personal appointments. This agency operates Mondays and Tuesdays, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., and Wednesdays, 2 p.m. to 5 p.m. Community Mobile requires their clients to reserve a seat 24 hours in advance and charges a fee based on those living on a fixed income.
**Scripps Ranch Senior Services Transportation**

This program offers transportation services to in-home clients, seniors, and adults with disabilities. Services are offered Monday thru Friday (weekends by appointment only), from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. The agency charges a $15 pick up fee and an additional $1.50 per mile, thereafter. Both van and accessible shuttle services are available. There are no known service area exclusions.

**Other Social Service Transportation Providers**

The 2006 survey allowed transportation service providers the opportunity to identify themselves as “other” than public, private or non-profit organizations. As a result, six agencies were included in the “other” category. These groups provide approximately 11,292 rides per year with 43 total vehicles (40 cars and 3 buses). Approximately 20 percent of these agencies provide transportation that is wheelchair accessible. According to the 2006 Inventory, “other” transportation providers provide the following services:

1. Direct transportation services (operate vehicles in-house) = 14 percent (one provider);
2. Transportation services using volunteers who use their own vehicles = 14 percent (one provider);
3. Direct services for clients at other agencies = 0 percent;
4. Transportation via contract (w/ another agency, vans, MRP, taxi voucher, shuttles, etc.) = 29 percent (two providers);
5. Only information and referral services regarding transportation options = 14 percent (one provider); and
6. Provide both information and referral and direct transportation services = 0 percent.

**6.4 Carsharing and Vanpool Alternatives**

Alternative public transportation opportunities are available in the San Diego region through existing carsharing and vanpooling programs. Carsharing is a system where a fleet of cars is owned and operated by a central organization which makes the cars available for use by its members. Carshare program members often view carsharing as a viable alternative to car ownership. Vanpooling and carpooling programs can involve coordination services such as ride matching but can also involve operation of regional van or car service. Carsharing and vanpooling services located in the San Diego region are described in greater detail below.

**Flexcar**

Flexcar has been providing a carsharing service in the San Diego region since 2002 and is currently the only carsharing program currently operating in San Diego County. Members pay an initial fee and then choose between various monthly or hourly plans. All Flexcar rates include the cost of gas, insurance, unlimited miles, 24/7 emergency assistance, vehicle maintenance, and reserved parking. There are currently 44 vehicles in the San Diego area, with locations in Downtown, Banker’s Hill, Golden Hill, Hillcrest, Little Italy, the Marina District, the Marine Corps Recruit Depot, North Park, Ocean Beach, Sorrento Valley, and UCSD.
Flexcar has also partnered with local colleges/universities, businesses, and public agencies, including, UCSD, SANDAG, and the Marine Corps Recruit Depot, to provide special incentives for car sharing.

**RideLink**

RideLink is the commuter services program for the San Diego region. The program is managed by SANDAG and offers free services to help commuters find alternatives to driving alone. Services include: carpool matching services (for work and school), regional vanpool program, “Guaranteed Ride Home” program, Bike to Work information, bike locker rentals throughout the County, transit information, teleworking information for employers, and customized commuting programs for employers.

RideLink’s vanpool program utilizes the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Improvement Program and the San Diego County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) funds to subsidize up to $400 per month of the van lease cost for approved vanpools. Vanpool costs range from approximately $600 to $1,400 per month for a variety of van sizes provided by one of three vendors. Commuters initiate and negotiate their own lease agreements. Maintenance and insurance is typically included in the lease cost, while van pool users pay for gas and the remainder of the van lease not covered by the subsidy.

RideLink’s regional bike locker network includes 559 locker spaces serving 467 current users. The lockers are currently free to use with a $25 or $35 security deposit for the key. Funding for management of the program and locker maintenance comes from CMAQ. RideLink is currently exploring a retrofit of existing lockers and purchase of new electronic on-demand units to make the network compatible with the Compass Card, the region’s new smart card standard.

6.5 Neighboring Systems

Transit services in adjacent jurisdictions connect to services to and from San Diego County and are therefore recognized in the regional transportation inventory.

**Orange County Transit Authority**

The Orange County Transit Authority (OCTA) is a multi-modal transportation agency serving Orange County. OCTA operates countywide bus and paratransit service, the 91 Express Lanes toll facility, freeway, street and road improvement projects, motorist aid services, regulation of taxi operations, and administers all of Orange County’s Metrolink rail corridor service.

OCTA recently prepared a draft Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) which provides the planning foundation for future transportation improvements. The proposed LRTP includes improvements to the transportation network, such as new and widened freeways, tollways, roadways, new and enhanced transit facilities, regional bikeway improvements, and new environmental programs.

Orange County’s current transit system includes a network of local bus routes that provide service to most residential and employment areas of the County, several express bus routes, and service for longer distance travel. The current (2004) level of ridership is 67.5 million riders. The number of Orange County riders on Metrolink has increased from less than 145,000 passengers in 1994 to over 3,000,000 passengers in 2004.
Orange County’s express buses use the freeway system to provide commuters with faster service over longer distances. There are currently nine express bus routes in place using Interstate 5 (I-5), Interstate 405 (I-405), State Route 91 (SR-91), and State Route 57 (SR-57) to connect major employment centers and park-and-ride lots.

OCTA’s goals for transit improvements include improving bus connections to Metrolink, developing Rapid Bus service on major arterials, and improving Metrolink frequency. None of OCTA’s routes serve San Diego County. However, OCTA Routes 1 and 191 serve San Clemente Plaza, where passengers can transfer to San Diego NCTD Breeze Route 395 to Camp Pendleton and Oceanside. Inter-agency transfers from OCTA to BREEZE buses are available upon request.

Riverside Transit Agency

The Riverside Transit Agency (RTA) is the Consolidated Transportation Service Agency for western Riverside County and is responsible for coordinating transit services throughout the approximate 2,500 square mile service area. RTA provides both local and regional services throughout the region with 38 fixed-routes, five CommuterLink routes, and Dial-A-Ride services using 231 vehicles. RTA Route 202 provides peak hour commuter express service from Temecula to Oceanside Transit Center for connections to NCTD’s COASTER service. There is no interagency transfer agreement between San Diego and RTA.

Imperial Valley Transit

Imperial Valley Transit (IVT) was created in 1989 as “Imperial County Transit.” It began as a five-route system with approximately 3,000 passengers a month. Today IVT has 18 routes with an average ridership of 23,000 passengers per month. The service is operated by LAIDLAW Transit Services, Inc., which is administered by the County Department of Public Works and funded by the Imperial Valley Association of Governments (IVAG).

Two Imperial Valley routes (Routes 400 and 450) serve the eastern edge of San Diego County at Ocotillo one time per week, with one stop each. However, there are no connecting routes from Ocotillo into the rest of San Diego County. The nearest MTS route serves Borrego Springs.

Tijuana

The border crossings between the United States and Mexico are the busiest in the world. Annually, more than 31 million cars carrying nearly 73 million passengers, 23 million pedestrians, and 1.3 million people arriving by bus have entered California from Mexico. In addition, nearly 1.3 million trucks enter the United States at the commercial crossings. Similar numbers of passengers, pedestrians, and vehicles head south from California to Mexico. To accommodate the border transportation system, a comprehensive effort is underway to improve access to border crossings, expand freight rail service, and coordinate commercial vehicle crossings.

A proposed third border crossing at East Otay Mesa would provide an alternate entry for vehicles and commercial trucks. In the United States, the proposed State Route 11 will connect the new border crossing to State Routes 905 and 125. In Mexico, the Tijuana-Rosarito 2000 Corridor will connect to the East Otay future Port of Entry (POE).
The draft Otay Mesa-Mesa de Otay Binational Corridor Strategic Plan proposes to improve cross-border travel, giving high priority to public transportation. The City of Tijuana has identified several transit issues, including saturated streets due to growth in vehicular travel, inadequate boarding facilities, an older bus fleet, lack of schedules for transit routes, and inadequate control of transit operations. A restructuring plan is proposed to better meet travel demand patterns in Tijuana.

Rail is another key component to the binational transportation system. Re-opening the (San Diego and Arizona Eastern Railway (SD&AE) Railway is proposed to improve the movement of goods through the Southern California/Baja California region. Existing freight service between San Diego and Tecate can be extended to the Imperial Valley by rehabilitating the Desert Line section of the SD&AE. Another rail improvement under consideration is a new rail line between Ensenada and Tecate that will connect to the SD&AE.

An additional method that facilitates border crossing is offered by the newest airline of Mexico, Volaris. This airline offers shuttle service from the Santa Fe Depot in San Diego to the Tijuana Airport in Mexico. A one-way ticket to Tijuana costs $15, and return services are also available from the Tijuana airport to both the San Ysidro border and Downtown San Diego. It should be noted that cross-border transit services require patrons to alight at the border, walk through the inspection area, and re-board their bus once they have cleared Mexican Customs.

6.6 Interregional Systems

Amtrak

Amtrak’s 351-mile Pacific Surfliner Corridor serves more than 2.5 million intercity passengers each year. Together with more than 6 million commuter passengers using either Metrolink or COASTER, it is the second busiest passenger rail corridor in the nation. The coastal corridor runs from San Diego to San Luis Obispo through six counties. Stations in San Diego County include Oceanside, Solana Beach, Old Town, and Downtown San Diego. Connections to the transit system occurs at each of these stations, including COASTER, Metrolink, Greyhound, local bus routes, the San Diego Trolley, and the future SPRINTER light rail route.

The Surfliner operates seven days per week, eleven times per day. Most service is between San Diego and Los Angeles; two round trips each day operate between San Luis Obispo and San Diego (including stops at Santa Barbara), while the other round trips operate between Los Angeles and San Diego.

Since 1989, SANDAG has been a member of the LOSSAN Rail Corridor Agency, which seeks to increase ridership, revenue, capacity, reliability, and safety on the corridor. Other members of LOSSAN are rail owners and operators and regional transportation planning agencies.

LOSSAN has secured funding for intercity rail programs. The State of California has invested more than $1 billion in the corridor, along with $200 million from Amtrak, and $300 million by local member agencies. Federal funding since 1996 has resulted in $24 million in improvements, including grade separations in the Cities of Solana Beach, Commerce, and Fullerton. LOSSAN also has obtained federal funds for the Del Mar Bluffs Stabilization Project.
LOSSAN aims to enhance funding for intercity rail, enhance service frequency and quality, improve safety, and promote transit-oriented development.

The Rail2Rail program allows the COASTER’s monthly passholders to ride Surfliner trains within the limits of their monthly pass. This provides additional options for people traveling between Santa Fe, Solana Beach and Oceanside. Similarly Amtrak passengers may ride the COASTER if they have a valid Amtrak ticket for service between Oceanside, Solana Beach and Santa Fe Station.

**Metrolink**

Metrolink is a regional rail system, including commuter and other passenger services, linking communities to employment and activity centers in Riverside, San Bernardino, the Inland Empire, Orange, and Ventura Counties. The services on board the Orange County line are offered on both weekdays and weekends.

Although the Orange County line provides connections to the Oceanside Transit Center and links San Diego County with Los Angeles and Orange County, there is currently not a transfer agreement in place between the COASTER and the Metrolink. Passengers wishing to continue their rail trip further south must purchase an additional ticket on the COASTER in order to get to their final destination. There is a transfer agreement allowing Metrolink passengers to transfer to the NCTD Breeze bus system however that transfer agreement is only valid one way.
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NEEDS ASSESSMENT
7 Needs Assessment

The assessment of needs includes the identification of existing transit service gaps as well as the identification of other areas which can improve the overall public transit and human services transportation system. Existing gaps and transportation needs included in this chapter were identified though detailed demographic analysis and the various public outreach efforts described in Chapter 2.

7.1 Outreach Efforts - Summary of Transportation Needs

A number of transportation needs were identified through the outreach program. Transportation needs are organized into the following categories and subcategories, including the number of times the need was identified along with the specific population desiring the improvement:

- Public Transit Service Needs
  - Fixed-route
  - Commuter Services
  - ADA Paratransit Services
  - Passenger Amenities
  - Other
- Supplemental Transportation Program (STP) Needs
- Public Information About Transportation Services
- Safety
- Accessibility
- Coordination
- Trip Needs
- Other

Public Transportation Service Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Received</th>
<th>Frequency of Request</th>
<th>Market Segment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gaps in transportation options for the general public</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaps in transportation services serving individuals with limited means</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Low-income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaps in mobility options serving individuals with disabilities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaps in transportation options serving seniors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Seniors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited amenities at existing transit stations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased independence available to disabled riders restricted to using ADA paratransit services</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costliness of using ADA paratransit services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disabled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Supplemental Transportation Program (STP) Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Received</th>
<th>Frequency of Request</th>
<th>Market Segment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STPs' vehicle fleets inadequate to meet existing demand</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Senior, Disabled and Low-income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of resources to provide enough services to meet STPs' clientele's demand</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Senior, Disabled and Low-income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased independence and isolation issues with transportation disadvantaged clients</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Senior, Disabled and Low-income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties for CalWORKS clients to obtain and retain employment due to transportation issues</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Low-income</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Public Information About Transportation Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Received</th>
<th>Frequency of Request</th>
<th>Market Segment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of public knowledge about existing transportation services</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of public knowledge about public transportation routes and schedules</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of public knowledge about available STPs and which ones are appropriate for that individual person</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Senior, Disabled and Low-income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of public knowledge about the benefits of coordinated services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Senior, Disabled and Low-income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty with riders navigating the ADA certification process efficiently</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficiency and decreased independence of riders using paratransit who could potentially use fixed-route services</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Disabled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Received</th>
<th>Frequency of Request</th>
<th>Market Segment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safe pedestrian mobility at COASTER stations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved security at park-and-ride lots and transit stations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved security on transit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Accessibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Received</th>
<th>Frequency of Request</th>
<th>Market Segment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessible taxicabs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible bus stops and transit stations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible paths of travel to public transit stops</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External announcements on the buses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More transportation services that can accommodate larger wheelchairs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve vehicles to enhance accessibility</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Disabled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Coordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Received</th>
<th>Frequency of Request</th>
<th>Market Segment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing resources can be used more efficiently</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Senior, Disabled and Low-income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination efforts should result in a user friendly system that is available and accessible to all populations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited connections between health and human service transportation and public transit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Senior, Disabled and Low-income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing system could take advantage of new technologies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Senior, Disabled and Low-income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School districts may face additional coordination hurdles because of different vehicle standards and state requirements precluding other vehicles to access school sites</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some agencies may not be able to share their vehicles because their vehicles are at 100 percent capacity all day</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Trip Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Received</th>
<th>Frequency of Request</th>
<th>Market Segment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most common trips needs are medical trips and shopping trips</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Senior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trips for church, shopping, social visits, and entertainment are needed weekly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Senior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trips during off-peak hours, particularly midday weekday timeframes are needed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Senior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Demographic Analysis - Transit Service Gaps

#### Methodology

In addition to the concerns identified in the public outreach process, demographic and transit data was also utilized to identify service deficiencies and gaps. In future Coordinated Plans, the analysis of service gaps will also be based on the evaluation of the transportation system using the complete range of objectives and indicators provided in Chapter 4. A limited set of objectives and indicators will be utilized this year as the current available data is based on the pre-COA network of MTS and the pre-SPRINTER network of NCTD.

Transit service walking distance buffers were developed with detailed Census data\(^1\) (included in Chapter 5) to determine areas with larger population densities falling outside of the area covered by public transit. Quarter mile walking distance buffers were based on the guidelines presented in Chapter 4.\(^2\) Areas outside of the quarter mile transit buffer were cross-referenced with aerial photographs to ensure that they were at least representative of the densities included in the entire Census Block Group. Areas found to be less dense were not included in the needs assessment.

The analysis and presentation of the transit service gaps is organized by City, Community Planning Area, or other specific geographies. The list of gaps is based on areas that are beyond a quarter mile of a bus or transit stop. In addition, these areas are also categorized by regional geographic location (urban, suburban, or rural) based on the evaluation structure identified in Chapter 4 and the expectation that these areas should have different levels of transit service. For example, it would be expected to have frequent, high quality transit service in the urban core, whereas, this type of service would not be expected in the rural areas. In the future, park-and-ride facilities will be evaluated based on the separate access criteria (beyond one mile) for these facilities described in Chapter 4.

The population groups chosen for the transit gap analysis are consistent with the other groups described in this plan, which are:

---

\(^1\) Census Block Groups were utilized since they represent the smallest available census geography with detailed information on the general population and for select groups including people with limited incomes, disabled individuals and older adults.

\(^2\) The quarter-mile walking distance buffer was developed based on a correlation between walking distances and transit use which will be used to evaluate transit service access as part of the performance measurement process.
1. General Population
2. Individuals with Limited Means
3. People with Disabilities
4. Older Adults

While the analysis of transit gaps covers the entirety of San Diego County, it does not take into account changes made to the transportation system as a result of the MTS COA or any planned changes that will occur as a result of the NCTD SPRINTER implementation. However, these service changes will be incorporated into future Coordinated Plans with the analysis of gaps to be expanded in future editions of the RSRTP/Coordinated Plan.

7.2.2 General Population

An evaluation of the general population includes an assessment of residential locations and job locations to determine where transit deficiencies exist. Identified transit gaps involve both commuter needs for transit as well as for general trips relating to shopping, errands, medical appointments, etc.

The analysis of the general population revealed several areas of the county with higher population densities that are not well served by public transit (see Figures 7.1 and 7.2). These residential areas (categorized by the urban, suburban and rural subregions) are:

**Urban Area**
- San Ysidro
- Skyline/Paradise Hills
- Spring Valley
- Lemon Grove
- La Mesa
- North El Cajon
- Linda Vista
- University
- Peninsula
- City Heights
- San Marcos
- Vista
- Oceanside
- Northeast Oceanside

**Suburban Area**
- East Chula Vista
- Valle de Oro
- Mira Mesa
- 56 Corridor (Carmel Valley, Pacific Highlands Ranch, Del Mar Mesa, Torrey Highlands, Rancho Peñasquitos, Black Mountain Ranch, and Carmel Mountain Ranch)
- Encinitas
- Fallbrook
Rural Area
• Ramona

The analysis of the general population also revealed that there are several areas of the County that have higher workplace densities that are also underserved by public transit (see Figures 7.3 and 7.4). These employment areas (categorized by the urban, suburban and rural subregions) are:

Urban Area
• San Marcos
• Mission Valley
• National City
• La Mesa
• North El Cajon

Suburban Area
• Carlsbad
• Fallbrook
• Rancho Bernardo
• Mira Mesa
• Kearny Mesa
• Coronado (NASNI)

Rural Area
• None
Figure 7.1: Population Density (Place of Residence) Beyond Transit Service Area—Southern Area

San Diego Region South

Population Density Beyond 1/4 Mile Transit Service Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons per Acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00 - 2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.01 - 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.01 - 10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.01 - 20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transit Routes
- Coaster
- Trolley
- Express Bus
- Local Bus

Source: Census 2000, Block Group Data
Figure 7.2: Population Density (Place of Residence) Beyond Transit Service Area—Northern Area

San Diego Region North

Population Density Beyond 1/4 Mile Transit Service Area

- **Persons per Acre**
  - 0.00 - 2.00
  - 2.01 - 4.00
  - 4.01 - 10.00
  - 10.01 - 20.00
  - Above 20

**Transit Routes**
- Coaster
- Trolley
- Express Bus
- Local Bus

1/4 Mile Buffer
- Suburban/Rural Boundary
- Urban/Suburban Boundary

Source: Census 2000, Block Group Data
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  - 2.01 - 4.00
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  - Above 20

**Transit Routes**
- Coaster
- Trolley
- Express Bus
- Local Bus

1/4 Mile Buffer
- Suburban/Rural Boundary
- Urban/Suburban Boundary

Source: Census 2000, Block Group Data

San Diego Region North

Population Density Beyond 1/4 Mile Transit Service Area

- **Persons per Acre**
  - 0.00 - 2.00
  - 2.01 - 4.00
  - 4.01 - 10.00
  - 10.01 - 20.00
  - Above 20

**Transit Routes**
- Coaster
- Trolley
- Express Bus
- Local Bus

1/4 Mile Buffer
- Suburban/Rural Boundary
- Urban/Suburban Boundary

Source: Census 2000, Block Group Data
Figure 7.4: Population Density (Place of Work) Beyond Transit Service Area-Northern Area

San Diego Region North

Employment Density Beyond 1/4 Mile Transit Service Area

Employees per Acre
- 0.00 - 2.00
- 2.01 - 4.00
- 4.01 - 10.00
- 10.01 - 20.00
- Above 20

Transit Routes
- Coaster
- Trolley
- Express Bus
- Local Bus

Source: Census 2000, Block Group Data
7.2.3 People with Limited Means

An evaluation of individuals in poverty included both an assessment of residential locations and job locations to determine where potential transit deficiencies exist for this population group. Particular attention has been focused on the journey-to-work trip for those individuals who need to commute to and from their place of employment and may be eligible for funding under the federal Jobs Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) (Section 5316) program.

The analysis of this population group showed that there are areas of the county that have higher population densities of individuals in poverty that are not well served by public transit (see Figures 7.5 and 7.6). An evaluation of zero car households was also included due to the high correlation between households without automobiles and poverty. The residential areas with workers in poverty and areas with higher concentrations of zero car households are:

**Urban Area**
- San Ysidro
- City Heights
- University
- Linda Vista

**Suburban Area**
- Fallbrook

**Rural Area**
- None

**Zero Car Households**
- City Heights (Urban), North Park (Urban), and Fallbrook (Suburban)

Workplace transit service gaps also were determined as a result of the need to evaluate both trip ends of the commuter work trip. The employment areas with deficiencies or gaps in transit service for workers in poverty are (see Figures 7.7 and 7.8):

**Urban Area**
- National City
- La Mesa
- College Area
- Mission Valley

**Suburban Area**
- Fallbrook
- Kearny Mesa
- Carlsbad - Palomar Airport Road Corridor
- Vista - Business Parks

**Rural Area** - None
Figure 7.5: Working Population Below Poverty (Place of Residence) Beyond Transit Service Area-Southern Area

San Diego Region South
Working Population Below Poverty Beyond 1/4 Mile Transit Service Area (Place of Residence)

Workers in Poverty per Acre
- 0.00 - 0.25
- 0.26 - 1.00
- 1.01 - 2.00
- 2.01 - 4.00
- Above 4

Transit Routes
- Coaster
- Trolley
- Express Bus
- Local Bus
- 1/4 Mile Buffer
- Suburban/Rural Boundary
- Urban/Suburban Boundary

Source: Census 2000, Block Group Data
Figure 7.6: Working Population Below Poverty (Place of Residence) Beyond Transit Service Area-Northern Area

San Diego Region North

Working Population Below Poverty Beyond 1/4 Mile Transit Service Area (Place of Residence)

Workers in Poverty per Acre

- 0.00 - 0.25
- 0.26 - 1.00
- 1.01 - 2.00
- 2.01 - 4.00
- Above 4

Transit Routes

- Coaster
- Trolley
- Express Bus
- Local Bus

1/4 Mile Buffer

Suburban/Rural Boundary

Urban/Suburban Boundary

Source: Census 2000, Block Group Data

February 2006
Figure 7.7: Working Population Below Poverty (Place of Work) Beyond Transit Service Area-Southern Area

San Diego Region South
Working Population Below Poverty Beyond 1/4 Mile Transit Service Area (Place of Work)

Workers in Poverty per Acre
- 0.00 - 0.25
- 0.26 - 1.00
- 1.01 - 2.00
- 2.01 - 4.00
- Above 4

Transit Routes
- Coaster
- Trolley
- Express Bus
- Local Bus

1/4 Mile Buffer
- Suburban/Rural Boundary
- Urban/Suburban Boundary

Source: Census 2000, Block Group Data

Source: SANDAG
February 2006
Figure 7.8: Working Population Below Poverty (Place of Work) Beyond Transit Service Area-Northern Area

San Diego Region North

Working Population Below Poverty Beyond 1/4 Mile Transit Service Area (Place of Work)

Workers in Poverty per Acre
- 0.00 - 0.25
- 0.26 - 1.00
- 1.01 - 2.00
- 2.01 - 4.00
- Above 4

Transit Routes
- Coaster
- Trolley
- Express Bus
- Local Bus

Source: Census 2000, Block Group Data
7.2.4 Individuals With Disabilities

Gaps and deficiencies in service for individuals with disabilities also were evaluated to help assess transit needs for this population subgroup. The assessment of the transportation needs of persons with disabilities includes work and nonwork trips.

Based on the assessment of the variety of residential based trip needs (for work trips and other trips) gaps in transit service were found in the following higher density residential locations (see Figures 7.9, 7.10, 7.11, and 7.12):

**Urban Area**
- San Ysidro
- Skyline/Paradise Hills
- Spring Valley
- City Heights
- North Park
- Chula Vista
- Northeast Oceanside

**Suburban Area**
- Mira Mesa
- Fallbrook

**Rural Area**
- None

Transit service gaps at the place of employment for individuals with disabilities also were identified in the San Diego region. The employment areas where transit service gaps were found include (see Figures 7.13 and 7.14):

**Urban Area**
- College Area
- Mission Valley
- National City

**Suburban Area**
- Fallbrook
- Kearny Mesa

**Rural Area**
- None
Figure 7.9: Population Density of People with Disabilities (Place of Residence) Beyond Transit Service Area-Southern Area

San Diego Region South

Population Density of People With Disabilities Beyond 1/4 Mile Transit Service Area

Disabled Persons per Acre

- 0.00 - 2.00
- 2.01 - 4.00
- 4.01 - 10.00
- 10.01 - 20.00
- Above 20

Transit Routes

- Coaster
- Trolley
- Express Bus
- Local Bus

1/4 Mile Buffer
Suburban/Rural Boundary
Urban/Suburban Boundary

Source: Census 2000, Block Group Data
Figure 7.10: Population Density of People with Disabilities (Place of Residence) Beyond Transit Service Area-Northern Area

San Diego Region North
Population Density of People With Disabilities Beyond 1/4 Mile Transit Service Area

Disabled Persons per Acre
- 0.00 - 2.00
- 2.01 - 4.00
- 4.01 - 10.00
- 10.01 - 20.00
- Above 20

Transit Routes
- Coaster
- Trolley
- Express Bus
- Local Bus

1/4 Mile Buffer
Suburban/Rural Boundary
Urban/Suburban Boundary

Source: Census 2000, Block Group Data
Figure 7.11: Population Density of Disabled Workers (Place of Residence) Beyond Transit Service Area - Southern Area

San Diego Region South
Population Density of Disabled Workers Beyond 1/4 Mile Transit Service Area (Place of Residence)

Disabled Persons per Acre

- 0.00 - 0.25
- 0.26 - 1.00
- 1.01 - 2.00
- 2.01 - 4.00
- Above 4

Transit Routes
- Coaster
- Trolley
- Express Bus
- Local Bus

1/4 Mile Buffer
- Suburban/Rural Boundary
- Urban/Suburban Boundary

Source: Census 2000, Block Group Data

February 2006
Figure 7.12: Population Density of Disabled Workers (Place of Residence) Beyond Transit Service Area-Northern Area

San Diego Region North
Population Density of Disabled Workers Beyond 1/4 Mile Transit Service Area (Place of Residence)

Disabled Persons per Acre

- 0.00 - 0.25
- 0.26 - 1.00
- 1.01 - 2.00
- 2.01 - 4.00
- Above 4

Transit Routes
- Coaster
- Trolley
- Express Bus
- Local Bus

1/4 Mile Buffer
- Suburban/Rural Boundary
- Urban/Suburban Boundary

Source: Census 2000, Block Group Data
San Diego Region South
Population Density of Disabled Workers Beyond 1/4 Mile Transit Service Area (Place of Work)

Disabled Persons per Acre
- 0.00 - 0.25
- 0.26 - 1.00
- 1.01 - 2.00
- 2.01 - 4.00
- Above 4

Transit Routes
- Coaster
- Trolley
- Express Bus
- Local Bus

1/4 Mile Buffer
- Suburban/Rural Boundary
- Urban/Suburban Boundary

Source: Census 2000, Block Group Data

Figure 7.13: Population Density of Disabled Workers (Place of Work) Beyond Transit Service Area-Southern Area

Kearny Mesa
Mission Valley
College Area
National City

Source: SANDAG
February 2006
Figure 7.14: Population Density of Disabled Workers (Place of Work) Beyond Transit Service Area-Northern Area

San Diego Region North
Population Density of Disabled Workers Beyond 1/4 Mile Transit Service Area (Place of Work)

Disabled Persons per Acre
- 0.00 - 0.25
- 0.26 - 1.00
- 1.01 - 2.00
- 2.01 - 4.00
- Above 4

Transit Routes
- Coaster
- Trolley
- Express Bus
- Local Bus

1/4 Mile Buffer
Suburban/Rural Boundary
Urban/Suburban Boundary

Source: Census 2000, Block Group Data

SANDAG
February 2006
7.2.5 Seniors

The assessment of senior transportation needs is an important and growing challenge given the expected increase in this population group over the next 25 years. Both 65+ and 85+ age ranges were included in the demographic analysis of older adults to determine as many gaps and deficiencies in existing transit service as possible. The following list includes the identified communities with both concentrations of older adults and deficient transit services (see Figures 7.15, 7.16 (Age 65+), 7.17, and 7.18 (Age 85+):

**Urban Area**
- San Ysidro
- Chula Vista
- Coronado
- Skyline/Paradise Hills
- Spring Valley
- City Heights
- College Area
- La Mesa
- Navajo
- Pacific Beach
- Linda Vista
- University
- Oceanside
- Northeast Oceanside
- San Marcos
- West Escondido

**Suburban Area**
- Mira Mesa
- South Carlsbad
- Lake San Marcos (Retirement)
- Rancho Bernardo
- Carmel Mountain Ranch
- Fallbrook

**Rural Area**
- None
Figure 7.15: Population Density of Persons Age 65+ (Place of Residence) Beyond Transit Service Area-Southern Area

San Diego Region South
Population Density of Persons 65+ Beyond 1/4 Mile Transit Service Area

Population Age 65+ per Acre
- 0.00 - 0.25
- 0.26 - 1.00
- 1.01 - 2.00
- 2.01 - 5.00
- Above 5

Transit Routes
- Coaster
- Trolley
- Express Bus
- Local Bus

1/4 Mile Buffer
- Suburban/Rural Boundary
- Urban/Suburban Boundary

Source: Census 2000, Block Group Data 

Figure 7.15: Population Density of Persons Age 65+ (Place of Residence) Beyond Transit Service Area-Southern Area
Figure 7.16: Population Density of Persons Age 65+ (Place of Residence) Beyond Transit Service Area-Northern Area

San Diego Region North
Population Density of Persons 65+
Beyond 1/4 Mile Transit Service Area

Population Age 65+ per Acre
- 0.00 - 0.25
- 0.26 - 1.00
- 1.01 - 2.00
- 2.01 - 5.00
- Above 5

Transit Routes
- Coaster
- Trolley
- Express Bus
- Local Bus

Source: Census 2000, Block Group Data

1/4 Mile Buffer
- Suburban/Rural Boundary
- Urban/Suburban Boundary

Map Legend:
- FALLBROOK
- Oceanside
- Northeast Oceanside
- South Carlsbad
- Lake San Marcos
- San Marcos
- West Escondido
- Rancho Bernardo
- Carmel Mountain Ranch
Figure 7.17: Population Density of Persons Age 85+ (Place of Residence) Beyond Transit Service Area-Southern Area

San Diego Region South

Population Density of Persons 85+ Beyond 1/4 Mile Transit Service Area

Population Age 85+ per Acre

- 0.00 - 0.25
- 0.26 - 1.00
- 1.01 - 2.00
- 2.01 - 5.00
- Above 5

Transit Routes

- Coaster
- Trolley
- Express Bus
- Local Bus

1/4 Mile Buffer
Suburban/Rural Boundary
Urban/Suburban Boundary

Source: Census 2000, Block Group Data
Figure 7.18: Population Density of Persons Age 85+ (Place of Residence) Beyond Transit Service Area-Northern Area

San Diego Region North

Population Density of Persons 85+
Beyond 1/4 Mile Transit Service Area

Population Age 85+ per Acre

- 0.00 - 0.25
- 0.26 - 1.00
- 1.01 - 2.00
- 2.01 - 5.00
- Above 5

Transit Routes

- Coaster
- Trolley
- Express Bus
- Local Bus

1/4 Mile Buffer
- Suburban/Rural Boundary
- Urban/Suburban Boundary

Source: Census 2000, Block Group Data

Rancho Bernardo
West Escondido
Carmel Mountain Ranch
Oceanside
Fallbrook

February 2006

Source: Census 2000, Block Group Data
CHAPTER 8

STRATEGIES AND PROJECTS
8 Strategies and Projects

This section of the Coordinated Plan identifies strategies designed to address the deficiencies and gaps in transportation services and to identify potentially redundant, under utilized, or duplicative services. The strategies included in this section were developed to respond to the needs identified as a result of various outreach efforts, demographic research, and spatial transit analysis. In the future, this analysis will also include the proposals that respond to deficiencies and gaps resulting from the evaluation of the objectives, indicators, and guidelines in Chapter 4.

8.1 Coordination – Basic Concepts

The coordination of public transit and human service transportation is a central theme of this plan, but also can be considered a strategy to eliminate gaps in service, remove real or perceived barriers to transportation, and improve inefficiencies in existing and future service. Coordination has been touted as a way to improve transportation service delivery for almost 50 years with interest in coordination coming from multiple levels of government and from various transportation providers and agencies.

Simply put, coordination is a path towards the effective management of limited resources requiring organizations to work together. In practice, coordination means doing more with less and becoming more efficient in the process. It also means allocating resources to maximize passenger benefits and has been called “the best way to stretch scarce resources and improve mobility for everyone” (Ohio Department of Transportation, 1997).

While coordination should not be seen as the solution to solve all human service and public transit needs, it is a necessary and important tool to help deliver an efficient and comprehensive regional transportation system. Table 8.1 illustrates some of the potential benefits of having a coordinated transportation system including the associated level of expected improvement or change.
### Table 8.1: Potential Benefits of Coordinated Transportation System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System Characteristics</th>
<th>Desired or Expected Change from Coordination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of transportation providers</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of agencies purchasing transportation</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Vehicles</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Drivers</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time/full-time driver ratio</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Hourly Driver Pay</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Driver Wages</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level and Quality of Driver Training</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours When Service is Provided Each Day</td>
<td>Expanded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days When Service is Provided Each Week</td>
<td>Expanded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Hours of Service</td>
<td>Maybe Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Miles of Service</td>
<td>Maybe Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Service Area</td>
<td>Expanded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Persons Who Can Get Services</td>
<td>Expanded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Purchasing</td>
<td>More Frequent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Dispatching of Agency Owned Vehicles</td>
<td>More Frequent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralized Oversight and Management</td>
<td>More Frequent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Route Duplication</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Funding Sources</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Transportation Funding</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Central Community Information Source</td>
<td>More Frequent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segregated Client Types</td>
<td>Less Frequent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Trip Purposes</td>
<td>Less Frequent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-wide Transportation Perspective</td>
<td>More Frequent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Spent in Meetings</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Planning Process</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### 8.1.1 Scheduling Made Easy

Beyond the overall benefits of coordinating transportation, a well coordinated system can, and should, simplify the experience for the rider in finding a ride and getting to his or her destination. Currently, the human service transportation system involves a confusing array of programs and agencies at various levels of government (see Figure 8.1).
Navigating the cumbersome bureaucratic maze illustrated in Figure 8.1, raises the question, “What can be done to make the process simpler?” Figure 8.2 illustrates one potential answer to this question involving a coordinated approach. This approach is based on a single call center concept where the traveler is not required to know all of the various interlocking governmental channels in accessing a ride. He or she simply calls the designated number and schedules the desired ride. Other models also may be developed to more effectively communicate the availability of rides. For example, some programs may choose to involve the use of the Internet where individuals can book their trip online.
8.1.2 Issues and Strategies

Within the context of a coordinated approach, the other identified issues involving public transit and human service transportation are listed in the next section along with possible strategies to address the issues. Creative and cost effective solutions are emphasized in order to expand the possibilities in developing an effective and efficient coordinated public transit and human services transportation system in the San Diego region.

Transportation Options

The identified transportation concerns regarding passenger transportation options along with strategies to resolve these issues are included in this section. The corresponding affected population group(s) also are included to further define the need, refine the possible solutions, and identify potential funding sources. Areas with identified gaps in transportation options were identified through the demographic and socio-economic analysis performed for this plan. In addition, public comments were received regarding transportation gaps and are noted as such. This section also identifies specific issues affecting Supplemental Transportation Programs (STPs) as identified through the public outreach process. STPs involve those services provided by social service and human service agencies also providing transportation. The identified issues involving STPs also include sample strategies and the corresponding affected population group(s).
1. Issue: Gaps in transportation options for the general public

Possible Strategies:

- Increase transportation options for the following urban residential areas:
  - San Ysidro
  - Skyline/Paradise Hills
  - Spring Valley
  - Lemon Grove
  - La Mesa
  - North El Cajon
  - Linda Vista
  - University
  - Peninsula
  - City Heights
  - San Marcos
  - Vista - North County Square
  - Oceanside
  - Northeast Oceanside
  - Escondido

- Increase transportation options for the following suburban residential areas:
  - East Chula Vista
  - Valle de Oro
  - Mira Mesa
  - 56 Corridor (Carmel Valley, Pacific Highlands Ranch, Del Mar Mesa, Torrey Highlands, Rancho Peñasquitos, Black Mountain Ranch, and Carmel Mountain Ranch)
  - Encinitas
  - Fallbrook
  - Kearny Mesa
  - Sorrento Valley

- Increase transportation options for the following rural residential areas:
  - Ramona
  - San Elijo Hills
  - Valley Center/Pala/Pauma
  - Unincorporated sections of San Diego County

- Increase employment-oriented transportation options to the following urban areas:
  - San Marcos
  - Vista Business Park
  - Mission Valley
  - National City
  - La Mesa
  - North El Cajon
• Increase employment-oriented transportation options to the following suburban areas:
  o Carlsbad
  o Fallbrook
  o Rancho Bernardo
  o Mira Mesa
  o Kearny Mesa
  o Coronado (NASNI)

• Increase weekend hours for fixed-route services
• Increase level of express service available
• Additional feeder services to the Trolley and SPRINTERT
• Increased COASTER service, including regular weekend service
• Increased SPRINTERT service, including weekend and late evening service
• Fixed-route connection from COASTER to Kearny Mesa
• Improve services serving rural areas including Fallbrook, Temecula, Escondido, Rancho Bernardo, and Kearny Mesa
• Commuter service from southern Riverside county
• Increased transportation services in the rural areas of the county
• Demand response transportation for areas not serviced by fixed-route

**Affected Population:** General public

2. **Issue:** Gaps in transportation services serving individuals with limited means

**Possible Strategies:**

• Increase employment-oriented transportation options from the following urban areas:
  o San Ysidro
  o City Heights
  o University
  o Vista
  o Oceanside
  o Linda Vista

• Increase employment-oriented transportation options from the Fallbrook suburban area
• Increase employment-oriented transportation options from the unincorporated rural areas of the county
• Increase employment-oriented transportation options to the following urban areas:
  o National City
  o La Mesa
  o College Area
  o Mission Valley
• Increase employment-oriented transportation options to the following suburban areas:
  o Fallbrook
  o Kearny Mesa

• Increase employment-oriented transportation options to the following areas noted in the assessment of the general public:
  o San Marcos
  o Vista Business Park
  o Mission Valley
  o National City
  o La Mesa
  o North El Cajon
  o Carlsbad
  o Fallbrook
  o Rancho Bernardo
  o Mira Mesa
  o Kearny Mesa
  o Coronado (NASNI)

• Extend hours of operation and increase early morning, late night and weekend services

Affected Population: Individuals with limited means

3. Issue: Gaps in mobility options for serving individuals with disabilities

Possible Strategies:

• Improve mobility options for the following areas:
  o San Ysidro
  o Skyline/Paradise hills
  o Spring Valley
  o City Heights
  o North Park
  o Chula Vista
  o Northeast Oceanside
  o Peacock Hills Senior Community – Oceanside (from public comment)

• Increase mobility options for the following suburban areas:
  o Mira Mesa
  o Fallbrook

• Increase mobility options to the unincorporated and rural areas of the county

• Increase employment-oriented mobility options to the following urban areas:
  o College Area
  o Mission Valley
  o National City
• Increase employment-oriented mobility options to the following suburban areas:
  o Fallbrook
  o Kearny Mesa

**Affected Population:** Individuals with disabilities

4. Gaps in transportation options serving seniors

**Possible Strategies:**

• Increase transportation options for the following urban areas:
  o San Ysidro
  o Chula Vista
  o Coronado
  o Skyline/Paradise Hills
  o Spring Valley
  o City Heights
  o College Area
  o La Mesa
  o Navajo
  o Pacific Beach
  o Linda Vista
  o University
  o Oceanside
  o Northeast Oceanside
  o San Marcos
  o West Escondido

• Increase local transportation options for the following suburban areas:
  o Mira Mesa
  o South Carlsbad
  o Lake San Marcos
  o Rancho Bernardo
  o Carmel Mountain Ranch
  o Fallbrook
  o Ocean Hills Senior Community – Oceanside (from public comment)

• Increase transportation options for the unincorporated and rural areas of the county
• Provide more accessible public transit facilities near senior centers and high-density residential areas

**Affected Population:** Seniors
5. **Issue:** Limited amenities at existing transit stations

**Possible Strategies:**

- Install and maintain additional amenities including shelters, seating, trash cans, and lighting

**Affected Population:** General public

6. **Issue:** Decreased independence for disabled riders restricted to using ADA paratransit services

**Possible Strategies:**

- Increase paratransit service hours
- Shorter windows for pickup times
- Increased timeliness and reliability of pickup
- Increased efficiency and flexibility
- Decreased trip duration of paratransit rides
- Same day reservations
- Expanded paratransit eligibility beyond the three-quarter mile boundary
- Community transportation options

**Affected Population:** Individuals with disabilities

7. **Issue:** Costliness of using ADA paratransit services

**Possible Strategies:**

- Travel training to enable/encourage more individuals with disabilities to ride regular transit
- Study impact of further reducing fares for ADA certified on regular transit
- Coordination of paratransit with social service transportation
- Free trips for ADA certified passengers on fixed-routes

**Affected Population:** Individuals with disabilities

8. **Issue:** Supplemental Transportation Program’s vehicle fleets are inadequate to meet the existing demand

**Possible Strategies:**

- Upgrade vehicles
- Buy additional vehicles
- Buy additional wheelchair accessible vehicles

**Affected Population:** Seniors, individuals with limited means, and individuals with disabilities
9. **Issue:** Lack of resources to provide enough services to meet Supplemental Transportation Program's clientele demand

**Possible Strategies:**

- Hire additional drivers
- Hire additional administrative staff to coordinate services
- Increase service area
- Increase operating hours of accessible vehicles
- Improve efficiency of existing programs through the use of technologies such as web-based scheduling and/or the development of a call center for volunteer driver programs
- Support coalitions of similar programs such as the development of a volunteer driver program coalition

**Affected Population:** Seniors, individuals with limited means, and individuals with disabilities

10. **Issue:** Decreased independence and isolation issues with transportation disadvantaged clients

**Possible Strategies:**

- Distribute transportation vouchers
- Provide door-to-door services for trips such as low-cost nonemergency medical transportation and grocery shopping in areas without paratransit
- Provide taxi vouchers
- Provide door-through-door transportation when necessary
- More volunteer (privately owned vehicle and agency owned vehicle) driver programs
- Expand shuttle services

**Affected Population:** Seniors, individuals with limited means, and individuals with disabilities

11. **Issue:** Difficulties for CalWORKS clients to obtain and retain employment due to transportation issues

**Possible Strategies:**

- Provide transportation programs for CalWORKS clients to access county buildings for program orientation and training
- Provide Transportation services for CalWORKS clients to drop off their children at daycare prior to commuting to work

**Affected Population:** Individuals with limited means
8.1.1 Public Information

Public information provides a crucial link in the public transit and human services transportation system by providing ride information to passengers. The identified issues involving the existing public information system along with sample strategies and the corresponding affected population group(s) are:

1. **Issue:** Lack of public knowledge about existing transportation services

   **Possible Strategies:**
   - Community outreach and marketing of services
   - Transportation system guides
   - Transportation options marketing
   - Make improvements to sdcommute.com Web site
   - Improved information on routes and schedules for buses and trolley system
   - Improved dissemination of service change information
   - Improvement and maintenance of the STRIDE Web site
   - Development of a coordinated “one-call” center for human and social service transportation
   - Development of a mobility management center for all transportation services

   **Affected Population:** All

2. **Issue:** Lack of public knowledge about the benefits of coordinating services

   **Possible Strategies:**
   - Marketing, education, and outreach regarding coordinating transportation services and the obligation to fulfill the spirit of coordination from the federal guidance for the purpose of being eligible for and obtaining funding.

   **Affected Population:** Human and Social Service Agencies, seniors, individuals with limited means, and individuals with disabilities

3. **Issue:** Difficulty with riders navigating the ADA certification process efficiently

   **Possible Strategies:**
   - Provide an assistance program for individuals trying to become ADA certified

   **Affected Population:** Individuals with disabilities
4. **Issue:** Inefficiency and decreased independence of riders using paratransit who could potentially be using fixed-route services

**Possible Strategies:**

- Mobility/Travel Training

**Affected Population:** Individuals with disabilities

8.2.3 **Alternative Transportation Programs**

Alternative transportation programs involve those programs that facilitate the changing of transportation modes in order to improve cost efficiency or travel time efficiency. The identified issues which involve alternative transportation programs, with issues crossing the spectrum of transportation needs are identified below along with sample alternative transportation strategies including the targeted population group(s).

7. **Issue:** Lack of available public transportation services

**Possible Strategies:**

- Development of car loan programs for low-income eligible individuals in all areas including areas with existing low-car ownership such as Fallbrook, City Heights, and North Park
- Development or expansion of car sharing programs
- Development of station car programs providing vehicles to and from transit nodes to employment centers
- Development of nonmotorized transportation programs (such as bicycles) for low-income eligible individuals
- Expansion of public information regarding alternative transportation programs
- Expansion or support of existing vanpool programs

**Affected Population:** Individuals with limited means

8.2.4 **Safety**

The identified issues involving safety along with sample remediation strategies and the corresponding affected population group(s) are:

1. **Issue:** Safe pedestrian mobility at COASTER stations

**Possible Strategies:**

- Installation of pedestrian grade separations at COASTER stations

**Affected Population:** General public
2. **Issue:** Improved security at park-and-ride lots and transit stations

**Possible Strategies:**
- Installation of Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) devices and security personnel to monitor CCTV feeds
- Increase officer patrol in areas with known criminal activity

**Affected Population:** General public

3. **Issue:** Improve security on transit

**Possible Strategies:**
- Installation of in-vehicle CCTV devices and operator monitoring equipment
- Installation of signage notifying transit patrons of police monitoring activities via decals, posters, or other marketing material

**Affected Population:** General public

8.2.5 **Accessibility**

Accessibility is an issue that predominantly affects individuals with disabilities or who are permanently or temporarily mobility impaired. The identified issues involving accessibility along with sample strategies to improve accessibility and the corresponding affected population group(s) are:

1. **Issue:** Accessible taxicabs

**Possible Strategies:**
- Upgrade existing cabs to either enhance or provide accessibility
- Increase cab fleet with additional accessible vehicles

**Affected Population:** Individuals with disabilities

2. **Issue:** Accessible bus stops and transit stations

**Possible Strategies:**
- Retrofit existing bus stops to ensure accessibility and ADA compliance
- Upgrade bus stops to include weather protection

**Affected Population:** Individuals with disabilities
3. **Issue:** Accessible paths of travel to public transit stops  

**Possible Strategies:**  
- Improvement of accessible travel paths to transit stops and stations  

**Affected Population:** Individuals with disabilities

4. **Issue:** External announcements on the buses  

**Possible Strategies:**  
- Improve bus public address (PA) systems  
- Enhance driver training program to improve passenger information  

**Affected Population:** Individuals with disabilities

5. **Issue:** More transportation services that can accommodate larger wheelchairs  

**Possible Strategies:**  
- Include vehicles that can accommodate larger chairs in fleet  
- Improve dispatch communication system to ensure that passengers will be transported in the most appropriate vehicle  
- Community transportation options  

**Affected Population:** Individuals with disabilities

6. **Issue:** Improve vehicles to enhance accessibility  

**Possible Strategies:**  
- Replace older high-floor buses with newer low-floor models  
- Prioritize accessibility upgrades for existing vehicles  
- Increase the space and designated number of seats for disabled riders to accommodate more wheelchairs  

**Affected Population:** Individuals with disabilities

8.2.6 **Trip Needs**  

The topic of trip purpose and trip needs was a reoccurring theme among the aging population of San Diego County. As such, the identified issues involving trip needs and sample strategies to address those needs (including the corresponding affected population groups) are:
1. **Issue:** Most common trip needs are for medical and shopping purposes

   **Possible Strategies:**
   - Enhance transportation choices for discretionary and nonemergency medical trips

   **Affected Population:** Seniors

2. **Issue:** Trips for church, shopping, social visits, and entertainment needed weekly

   **Possible Strategies:**
   - Increase trip availability for discretionary trips throughout the week and on weekends

   **Affected Population:** Seniors

3. **Issue:** Trips during off-peak hours, particularly midday weekday trips

   **Possible Strategies:**
   - Increase service span to include off-peak hours and ensure midday trip coverage

   **Affected Population:** Seniors

8.2.7 **Coordination**

While coordinating public transit and human service transportation is critical, existing examples are few and far between. The following represents the existing issues and subsequent opportunities involving coordination and collaboration along with the affected population groups:

1. **Issue:** Existing resources can be used more efficiently

   **Possible Strategies:**
   - Increase coordination efforts in the forms of combining resources such as vehicles, riders, funds for rides, vehicle maintenance, drivers, driver training, insurance coverage, general ride subsidies, etc.
   - Require projects to coordinate with other transportation or resources in order to be eligible for Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC), New Freedom (NF), and Section 5310 funding
   - Encourage group purchasing of transportation equipment maximizing cost savings for equipment, vehicle maintenance, gas cards for volunteers, dispatching equipment, insurance, and software

   **Affected Population:** General public
2. **Issue:** Coordination efforts should result in a user-friendly system that is available and accessible to all populations

**Possible Strategies:**

- Development of a centralized ride scheduling, dispatching, and mobility center

**Affected Population:** General public

3. **Issue:** Limited connections between health and human service transportation and public transit

**Possible Strategies:**

- Increase information exchange between transit operators and health and human service transportation providers

**Affected Population:** General public

4. **Issue:** Transportation system could take advantage of new technologies

**Possible Strategies:**

- Purchase technology to promote cohesive use between public and private transportation providers

**Affected Population:** General public

5. **Issue:** School districts may face additional coordination hurdles because of different vehicle standards and state requirements precluding other vehicles to access school sites

**Possible Strategies:**

- Encourage coordination among school districts
- Encourage collaboration with State of California and the California Highway Patrol to modify requirements for vehicles accessing school sites

**Affected Population:** General public

6. **Issue:** Some agencies may not be able to share their vehicles because their vehicles are at 100 percent capacity all day

**Possible Strategies:**

- Develop the coordination of other activities such as driver training, insurance, maintenance programs, etc.

**Affected Population:** General public
8.2.8  Other

There are other miscellaneous issues that surfaced during the public involvement process which involve operators of transportation and passengers. The following issues and strategies are presented to include those issues, as well as the affected population groups:

1. **Issue:** Driver training

   **Possible Strategies:**
   - Enhance sensitivity training for drivers particularly for those assisting passengers with developmental disabilities

   **Affected Population:** General public including individuals with disabilities

2. **Issue:** Identified need for transit dependent individuals to get home for emergencies

   **Possible Strategies:**
   - Enhance existing guaranteed ride home programs\(^1\)

   **Affected Population:** Individuals with limited means

3. **Issue:** Trips are needed during off-peak hours, particularly during midday weekday time periods

   **Possible Strategies:**
   - Increase social service transportation in areas with denser senior populations

   **Affected Population:** Seniors

8.2.9  Duplication of Transportation Resources

Many providers of transportation operate with local, state, or federal funding. The funding is generally specific to eligibility of person and purpose of the trip, with no real incentive to coordinate transportation, while school districts and agencies providing transportation focus primarily on providing transportation for their specific customers. There also exists a reluctance to coordinate transportation services because of perceived risk, liability, and funding restrictions. The following areas were identified as areas which can be improved or coordinated to improve efficiency and service delivery:

- Training and Maintenance: School districts, transit, paratransit, and other transportation providers operate their own training programs for drivers and own maintenance program for vehicles.

\(^1\) The existing guaranteed ride home program provides an unscheduled ride home to commuters who carpool, vanpool, bike, use the COASTER, or premium bus service to get to work at least three times per week.
Eligibility: Each transportation system has different eligibility requirements for riders precluding efficient coordination.

Capital Cost and Purchasing: Each transportation system typically purchases own equipment and vehicles.

Reporting and Usage: Federal, State, and local funds used for transportation have different restrictions and reporting requirements.

Funding Source Restrictions: Various sources of funding restrict different transportation service to specific populations for specific purposes.

Areas of duplication present opportunities to develop strategies to work with transportation providers to collaborate and coordinate transportation resources.

8.2.10 Coordination of Transportation Resources

Coordination of transportation resources can create efficiencies which reduce overall costs and expand the array of services which can be provided. The benefits of coordinated human services and transportation services include:

**Economic Benefits:**

- Enhanced Mobility: Expanding the service area and hours increases employment opportunities for potential and underemployed workers
- Increased Efficiency: Reducing the cost per vehicle hours or miles traveled, potentially saving money for providers and users
- Economies of scale: Allows bulk purchasing of vehicles, insurance, maintenance, and training
- Additional Funding: More total funding and greater number of funding sources
- Increased Productivity: More trips per month or passengers per vehicle hour

**Social Benefits:**

- Allows Independence: Improves quality of life by providing access to work, medical needs, shopping, social events, and religious services for those who cannot drive
- Easy to Use System: Coordinated services are better publicized, reliable, and accessible for users with the potential of serving more destinations

Full Access & Coordinated Transportation, Inc. (FACT) is a relatively new nonprofit agency in San Diego County that was designed to bring full mobility to individuals within their community through an accessible transportation system that meets their individual need. Due to the size of San Diego County and because NCTD was a major supporter of FACT, it was decided that a pilot project would be the most prudent way to bring a coordinated transportation system to the County.

The area selected for the North County Pilot Project (NCPP) consists of six cities covering a total of 1,100 square miles. Public transportation in this area is provided by NCTD. The total population of the NCPP area is 890,000. This area contains several hospitals and medical centers, a state university, several large shopping centers, and many businesses and recreational areas.
The concept behind a pilot project is for FACT to identify the barriers and develop the techniques and resources necessary to create a coordinated transportation system in an area smaller than the entire county. The goal of the NCPP is to create the systems and solve the problems in a confined area and then introduce the solutions to the entire county in a step-wise fashion. FACT is committed to creating a system that works and truly serves the people in need of transportation. The lessons learned during the NCPP will be invaluable to the organized spread of coordinated transportation.

Work has begun on the NCPP. Representatives from the cities of Carlsbad, Oceanside, Vista, and San Marcos as well as representatives from the Oceanside Senior Citizens Association, Inc. (who operate the Oceanside Nutrition Program) and Redwood Elderlink (who provide senior transportation for the City of Escondido) have stepped forward to begin the process of coordination in the North County area. The group is developing plans for an operational pilot project that will provide rides for seniors and perhaps other individuals living in the North County area. The impetus for this group was a ruling by the California Department of Aging stating that vehicles used to transport seniors to the Senior Nutrition Programs, could be used within a coordinated transportation system. Current work includes identifying the decision-maker and decision-making process in each city and/or organization and determining the true cost of transportation for rides that will be offered to others who will eventually use the system. FACT staff does continual outreach to the public and many different agencies to teach them about the benefits of coordination and solicit them to participate in creating the new coordinated transportation system.

**Volunteer Driver Programs**

There are a number of volunteer driver programs in the San Diego area. FACT has been working with many of them to create a volunteer driver coalition, with a goal of the coalition applying for senior mini-grants that will be made available through the TransNet Program in 2009. Agencies that have expressed interest in joining together in a coalition are Jewish Family Service - Rides & Smiles, City of Vista – Out and About, Peninsula Sheppard Senior Center, City of Oceanside, City of La Mesa, Del Mar Community Connections, Encinitas Senior Center, and Zip Trip in El Cajon. Volunteer driver programs provide door-to-door transportation to a large number of seniors living within the service boundaries of these agencies.

This group has been meeting since January 2007, and is in the process of developing the guidelines for members of the coalition and standardizing rider application and data collection among the agencies. By coming together and gathering the same data the coalition will be able to demonstrate the true impact these agencies have on the seniors in San Diego.

**CTSA Training**

On March 27, 2007, a training was attended by 24 representatives from transportation agencies and programs around the county. The California Highway Patrol provided a two hour training on Pre-Trip Inspections and Driver Safety. The Summer of 2007 training schedule will focus on Compliance with Controlled Substances and Alcohol Testing Requirements.
8.2.11 TransNet Senior Mini-Grant Program

The recent extension of the TransNet half cent transportation sales tax for San Diego County includes a mini-grant program for specialized transportation services for seniors. TransNet designates 3.25 percent of the total 16.5 percent in annual TransNet transit operating and capital funding for the senior mini-grant program. This will yield approximately $1.0 million when funding becomes available in FY 2009. Funds will be awarded through a competitive grant process. As a regional agency, SANDAG will consider transportation services that address the transportation needs of seniors in all parts of the region for distribution of mini-grant funds. The senior mini-grant program is targeted towards older adults and to provide another source of funding for senior transportation programs in addition to the federal Elderly and Persons with Disabilities (Section 5310) and NF (Section 5317) programs.

A Senior Access Task Force convened and came up with multiple recommendations, among which they recommended using TransNet program funds to continue the discounted monthly pass for seniors and to establish a mini-grant program to fund senior STPs throughout the region.

STPs are programs offered by nonprofit organizations, health and human service agencies, local jurisdictions, or other small operators that are able to address numerous transportation needs of seniors including ride sharing, quantity and quality of life rides, escorts, flexible schedules, and low-cost fees. Examples of existing STPs include local shuttles, volunteer driver programs, nutrition programs, taxi vouchers, and hospital transportation services.

The TransNet Extension ordinance states that the mini-grant program funds “shall be used to provide specialized transportation services for seniors focusing on innovative and cost-effective approaches to providing improved senior transportation, including, but not limited to, shared group services, special shuttle services using volunteer forces, and brokerage of multi-jurisdictional transportation services.”

With the passage of the TransNet Extension Ordinance and Expenditure Plan in November 2004, (Proposition A), it was mandated in the ordinance that an Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC) for TransNet be formed to provide an enhanced level of accountability for the expenditure of funds under the Expenditure Plan. SANDAG will work with the ITOC in the fall of 2007 to determine the criteria that will be used to determine which projects will get awarded TransNet funding so that strategies can be included in the next Coordinated Plan.

Since Coordination among agencies increases the cost-effectiveness of dollars spent, projects that demonstrate coordination will be favored. This will allow the projects to collaboratively provide the most amount of service possible.
CHAPTER 9

FUNDING
9 Funding

Public transit and human service transportation in San Diego is funded from a variety of public and private sources. This chapter only addresses services that are in whole or partly funded with money from public transportation funding programs. Public transportation funding is available from federal, state, and local sources.

9.1 Federal

The current reauthorized federal Safe, Accountable, Flexible and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) legislation continues many of the programs created under the two previous transportation bills (ISTEA and TEA-21). For transit, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) administers these programs with some programs allocated under formula provisions while others are apportioned on a discretionary basis. The different federal transit funding programs are described below.

9.1.1 FTA Section 5307

The Urbanized Area Formula Program is apportioned annually to the urbanized areas of the state based on a formula consisting of population, population density, and transit revenue miles of service. This program funds capital projects, preventative maintenance, and planning activities. The urbanized area of San Diego County is shown in Figure 9.1. Once a reduction is made for regional planning and the regional vanpool program, the remaining funds are divided between the two transit agencies based on an agreed-upon formula of 30 percent to North County Transit District (NCTD) and 70 percent to the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS). The 5307 funds 80 percent of the cost of capital projects with a minimum requirement of a 20 percent local match.

9.1.2 FTA Section 5309 Fixed Guideway/Discretionary

There are two different programs under section 5309: fixed guideway and discretionary. Section 5309 fixed guideway is a formula program that funds infrastructure improvements to existing rail and other fixed guideway systems including track right-of-way rehabilitation, modernization of stations, rolling stock purchase, and signal/power modernization. The discretionary program is further divided among the New/Small Starts program for major transit capital projects and bus or bus facilities programs, which are apportioned by project on an annual basis.

MTS and NCTD are eligible for all three categories of funding. SANDAG will be pursing new starts and small starts funding for several projects including the proposed Mid Coast trolley line and various Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) projects. Earmarks have been obtained in the past for discretionary funds under 5309.

A FTA Section 5309 grant provides a maximum of 80 percent of capital costs and requires a minimum local match of 20 percent. Historically for the two discretionary programs, local share has exceeded the minimum 20 percent of total project cost. Under SAFETEA-LU guidelines, local match money can now include federal sources other than from the FTA.
Figure 9.1: Urbanized Area of San Diego County
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9.1.3 FTA Section 5311

This section was expanded to include several new programs under SAFETEA-LU and provides capital and operating expenses for rural and small urban public transportation systems and services. These programs are defined below.

- **Rural**

Prior to 2005, the rural area of San Diego County was serviced by NCTD and the then County Transit Service (CTS), with the funding share, by agreement, allocated to NCTD. Since the divestiture of service by CTS and subsequent state legislation changing the boundary of MTS to include the rural areas previously serviced by CTS, Section 5311 funds are now divided between NCTD and MTS. Also, the amount of the Section 5311 funding was increased by approximately 50 percent in SAFETEA-LU. The funds may be used for capital or operating costs. Local matches of 20 percent for capital and 50 percent for operations are required. This program is based on statewide appropriations and is administered by Caltrans.

- **Inter-City**

This program funds bus services operating between rural and urban areas or linking rural areas with mainline rail and inter-city bus services. MTS received money from this fund in 2007. Both MTS and NCTD are seeking additional funding from this program in 2008. The funds may be used for capital or operating costs. Local matches of 20 percent for capital and 50 percent for operating are required. Similar to the rural program, this program is based on statewide appropriations and is administered by Caltrans.

- **Tribal Transit**

This is a nationwide program to fund transit services on Indian reservations or linking reservations to other activity centers. No local match is required and the service must be accessible and open to all users, not just members of Indian tribes. Money may be used for planning, startup or system enhancements. No funds have been awarded to the tribes in San Diego County; however, a grant application will likely be submitted in FY 2008.

9.1.4 FTA Section 5310

Funds from Section 5310 are allocated by formula to states for capital costs of providing services to the elderly and disabled. While in some states the program funds operations, only capital projects are eligible in California. SANDAG participates in evaluating local applications for Section 5310 funds. Eligible uses include purchase of vans, radio equipment, dispatch hardware or software, and other related equipment. The program is administered by the state and the funds are allocated annually by the California Transportation Commission. Effective in 2008, in order to be eligible, the project must be included in the Coordinated Plan. The local match requirement is approximately 11 percent.
9.1.5 FTA Section 5316

Also known as Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC), this program was converted from a discretionary fund under TEA-21 to a formula fund under SAFTEA-LU. The fund provides support for capital or operating costs for transportation services and facilities designed to facilitate reverse commute employment related travel for persons of limited means. Projects funded in this section must be included in the Coordinated Plan. In San Diego County, the funds for the urbanized area are awarded by SANDAG based on an annual appropriation. The rural portion of the funds are awarded by Caltrans and are based on a statewide appropriation. In the first year of SAFETEA-LU, grants were awarded by SANDAG for three bus services operated by MTS and a bus stop improvement program at NCTD. A local match of 20 percent is required for capital and mobility management projects, with a match of 50 percent required for operations. The funds must be awarded following a competitive process.

9.1.6 FTA Section 5317

This new program known as New Freedom (NF) is dedicated to supporting transportation operations or capital expenditures. A local match of 20 percent is required for capital and mobility management projects, with a match of 50 percent required for operations. The money must be used to support transportation projects that go above and beyond the requirements of Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) legislation and regulation. Persons benefiting from these funds are not required to be ADA certified. The funds also must be awarded following a competitive process. In 2007, SANDAG awarded funds from this program to the CTSA, NCTD, and to a senior community center.

9.1.7 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Funds

Administered by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), these funds are known as ‘flexible’ funds, which can be used for transit capital projects and for certain operating expenses. The CMAQ program provides funding for projects or services that contribute to the attainment or maintenance of federal air quality standards. Transit operators are not the only agencies that qualify for these grants and there can be stiff competition for these funds. Previous federal legislation allowed transit agencies to use CMAQ for operating purposes for the first three years of startup service. However, SAFETEA-LU implementation guidelines no longer allows New Start funded projects this eligibility. Currently, the operating costs of the Green Line trolley extension is supported with CMAQ and the SPRINTER service anticipates use of CMAQ funds when it starts service at the end of 2007.

9.1.8 Surface Transportation Program (STP)

The Surface Transportation Program is primarily designed to support road and highway projects. However, under the flexible funding rules this program can be applied to transit but there may be strong competition for these funds. In Los Angeles County, the Surface Transportation Program funds are traded for FTA Section 5310 operating funds, which are then used to meet some of the costs of providing ADA service.
9.2 State

State funding sources generally include motor fuel taxes, special fuel taxes, vehicle registration fees, and drivers license fees. State funding for transit projects are available through the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), which includes the Regional Improvement Program (RIP) and the Interregional Improvement Program (IIP). The RIP is allocated by county based on a formula while the IIP is allocated based on a competitive process administered by the California Transportation Commission (CTC). In addition to the STIP, the State Transit Assistance (STA) is funded with 50 percent of the Public Transit Account (PTA) revenues which come from sales tax on fuel prices, as well as fuel consumption.

9.2.1 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP-RIP/IIP)

SANDAG proposes the projects to be funded under the RIP share of the STIP. Although major highway projects have been recipients of STIP funds, regional transit project such as Mid-Coast and Fare Technology have received funding under the RIP. For the IIP, Caltrans usually nominates regional rail projects for funding. Projects such as Del Mar Bluffs Stabilization, Sorrento-Miramar realignment, and San Dieguito Bridge have been funded under this competitive program.

9.2.2 State Transit Assistance Program (STA)

The STA program is derived from the Public Transit Account (PTA) and provides for operating and capital funding for transit operators. Half of the funds in the PTA support state programs including the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The remaining PTA balance goes to the STA program. Within STA, 25 percent is allocated to regional entities according to a population formula, and an additional 25 percent is allocated to regional entities to be allocated in turn to individual operators proportionately based on a revenue formula. The STA also outlines specific requirements and eligibilities that each transit operator must meet in order to receive STA funds.

In 2006, the voters of California approved a major infrastructure bond program: the Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Bond Act of 2006 (Proposition 1B). This bond includes additional capital funding via formula for transit agencies. Although the method of allocation is still to be determined by CTC, both NCTD and MTS are expected to receive approximately $218 million through 2012. NCTD plans to use its entire Proposition 1B funding toward completion of the SPRINTER project, while MTS plans to use its funds for several projects identified under the transit Early Action Program (EAP), which also will be partially funded by the local TransNet program (see below under Local).

9.2.3 Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP)

In 2000, the Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP) was proposed by the then governor and enacted by the legislature. Out of the nearly $500 million awarded to the San Diego region, $197 million were allocated for various transit projects.
9.3 Local

Local funds include monies from the regional sales tax for transportation (TransNet), the Transportation Development Act (TDA), transit fares, and other miscellaneous local funds such as advertising revenue and some related commercial activities such as concessions and real estate development.

9.3.1 TransNet

In November 1987, (Proposition A) the voters of San Diego approved a half cent increase in sales tax to fund transportation projects over the next 20 years. The sales tax became effective on April 1, 1988, and will continue until March 31, 2008, generating over $3 billion for regional transportation improvements. In November 2004, the voters of San Diego approved the extension of the same sales tax for transportation through the year 2048. It is anticipated that an additional $14 billion in revenues would be generated for regional transportation improvements.

For the current TransNet, funding is distributed in equal thirds among highway, transit, and local street and road projects. The one-third of TransNet sales tax revenues dedicated for transit purposes is allocated by population to MTS and NCTD. By vote of the SANDAG Board of Directors in June 2003, the maximum available for non-rail capital purposes, such as transit operations or bus rapid transit construction (formerly limited to 20 percent of the total transit share of TransNet annual revenues) was increased to 40 percent. As a result no less than 60 percent of the annual TransNet revenues must be used for specific rail-related capital improvements.

The TransNet extension provides for a different distribution of funds beginning in FY 2009. After deducting costs associated with the administration of the program, the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC), and the bicycle/pedestrian program, beginning in FY 2009 the TransNet program is divided into Major Corridor Projects (42.4 percent), New Bus Rapid Transit/Rail Operations (8.1 percent), Local System Improvements (33 percent), and Transit System Improvements (16.5 percent) from which the transit revenues are derived. Within the transit share, services provided pursuant to ADA and subsidies for seniors have specific earmarks (2.5 percent and 3.25 percent, respectively). The remaining revenues can be used for operating or miscellaneous capital purposes. The TransNet ordinance also includes a provision that covers the cost of reducing senior and youth passes from 50 percent to 25 percent of the cost of an adult pass.

9.3.2 Transportation Development Act (TDA)

The Local Transportation Fund (LTF) as provided in the TDA is the major subsidy source that supports the region’s public transit operators and non-motorized transportation projects. The LTF comes from a quarter percent of state sales tax assessed in the region. Among other uses, the LTF is allocated in San Diego County between MTS, CTSA, and NCTD for conventional transit, paratransit, and transportation coordination. SANDAG also receives a portion of this funding to support the regional planning. Transit operators must meet several requirements including farebox recovery ratio, and other goals established by SANDAG through the RSRTP and the Coordinated Plan.
9.3.3 Fares

SANDAG is responsible for establishing the regional fare policy for all public transit operations in San Diego. SANDAG will be proposing a new unified fare structure and price levels during the summer of 2007. The new fare structure also will include recommendations on how fare revenue should be shared between the two districts.

9.3.4 Tolls

The existing and future managed lane programs on regional freeways including Interstate 15 (I-15), Interstate 805 and Interstate 5 are designed to pass any surplus revenues from the roadway to the transit agencies. At the present time, MTS receives any surpluses generated from the existing I-15 toll segment. The amount of money generated by the managed lanes does vary and has currently fallen from a high of about one million dollars to less than $300,000. As more managed lanes are built or extended, it is anticipated that this revenue source will grow.

9.3.5 Air Quality Control District

The County of San Diego’s Air Pollution Control District provides funding for the Sorrento Valley COASTER Connection services and other projects such as printing the County Juror transit passes.
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Implementation of services based on this plan will largely be the responsibility of the transit operators, health and human service agencies, the Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA), and other public agencies (e.g., cities, tribes). SANDAG will service as a conduit for federal, state, and local funding of existing and future services recommended in this plan. SANDAG also will be involved in developing and promoting some alternative transportation modes (e.g., vanpools) and enhancing transportation information (e.g., 511). A call for competitive proposals will be issued to public and private providers for funding opportunities such as Section 5310 (seniors and disabled), Jobs Access and Reverse Commute (JARC), New Freedom (NF), and the future senior minigrant program.

SANDAG will monitor new and existing services and report back to the Transportation Committee on progress toward achieving the goals, objectives, guidelines, and targets established in this document.

Competitive Processes

Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equip Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) specifically requires the designated recipient of JARC and NF funds to hold a competitive process to solicit projects that respond to the needs and strategies identified in this Coordinated Plan. SANDAG, as the designated recipient for the urbanized area of San Diego County, will undertake a competitive process in the fall of 2007. This process will award grants from the federal fiscal budget of 2007, for use in the next two years.

In addition, SANDAG also will participate in the competitive process to award funds under Federal Transit Administration Section 5310 for capital projects for transportation for seniors and persons with disabilities. The actual process will be managed by Caltrans on a statewide basis; however, SANDAG will provide evaluations of local applications.

SANDAG also expects to participate in the competitive process for JARC and NF applications from the rural areas of the county. This competitive process also will be run by Caltrans on a statewide basis. All projects selected by Caltrans for the rural area must be derived from the Coordinated Plan.

Transit Budgets

Each year the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and the North County Transit District (NCTD) are required to submit a Service Improvement Plan (SIP) in advance of budget approvals. The purpose of the SIP is for the transit agencies to identify what actions they will be taking in the next year to implement services that respond to regional goals and objectives. However, due to timing of the SPRINT bus redesign project and changes related to the MTS COA, the transit agencies were unable to prepare the SIPs this year.
In future years, it is the intent that the Coordinated Plan will be completed by early spring. The evaluation of Transportation Development Act factors and the goals and objectives will enable MTS and NCTD to prepare SIPs that respond to the issues, needs, and gaps identified by SANDAG. This complete package will be available to the Transportation Committee to assist in their annual budget deliberations.

**Post Implementation Monitoring**

This Coordinated Plan is primarily a policy based plan; however, in the future, the document will add more quantitative analysis on a regional basis as more data becomes available on public transit and supplementary transportation providers. New technologies also are being implemented in transit, including Automatic Vehicle Location devices, the Compass Card and Automatic Passenger Counting devices. These new technologies will increase the amount of data available when future plans are being produced. The timeliness of the data and the accuracy also should be improved. Future plans will address the data priorities and recommend where efforts should be made to improve the flow of information.

Currently, very little data is available on transportation coordination or the human service transportation system. As SANDAG becomes more involved in funding these services, it is expected that more information will become available on the performance of these systems. The performance data will be fed back into the planning process and priorities may be adjusted.

**Unforeseen Events**

This plan has been prepared based on the best information available and the current guidance and priorities from senior levels of government. Unforeseen events such as escalations in fuel prices, changes to funding formulae or annual appropriations could impact local transportation operations. All publicly funded transportation operations in San Diego are operating in a financially constrained environment and have very little room to maneuver. Recent developments such as the state bond improvements have improved the outlook, but to some extent have been tempered by recent announcements that an expected windfall in State Transportation Assistance funding due to rising fuel tax collections may not flow through to transit operators as envisioned.

The success of the Comprehensive Operations Analysis and the opening of the SPRINTER in December 2007, followed by the I-15 Bus Rapid Transit later in this plan period, have the potential to significantly change the baseline levels of transit ridership and performance in San Diego. The combined impact of these changes may cause significant changes to this plan over next five years.

**Relationship to Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)**

This Regional Short-Range Transportation Plan and Coordinated Plan have been developed at the same time as the updated long-range Regional Transportation Plan is being prepared. This document has looked to the current RTP for guidance on the Transit Vision and Goals and provided input to the new RTP. The current RTP provides very limited discussion of senior’s transportation and virtually no guidance is provided on the topic of human service transportation development. These topics will receive expanded coverage in the next RTP and this plan will be altered in future years, as required, to align with other changes in the long range vision.